LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 27 1960
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE IN KARL BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF RECONCILIATION

by

Paul Harold Gertmenian

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY
to the
THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT
of
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
1960

PREFACE

A few introductory remarks on the methodology used in this study seem in order in view of the vastness of the material written by Karl Barth himself and by students of his work. A look at the Bibliography will reveal that I have in no way sought to exhaust all this material. Rather there was a concentration on the Kirchliche Dogmatik, with other sources used only for background material or as they illumined the problem of this study.

It would seem that such a course must be followed if doctoral work is to be done by Protestant students on the theology of Barth. As instructive as it would be to read through all the works of Barth and all the interpretations of this work, such a task is simply impossible if a thesis is not to become a life project or suffer from superficiality.

In reference to the interpretations of Barth, I leaned heavily on the outstanding work done by the Roman Catholic scholars Hans Urs von Balthasar and Henri Bouillard, as well as the work of the Dutch theologian G. C. Berkouwer. These three works by far stand head and shoulders above the rest as studies of Barth's theology in general, although there is much outstanding work on individual aspects of Barth's thought by others.

It will also be noticed that the English translation of Barth's work was used wherever this was possible.

Although the German text was frequently consulted throughout the entire study, and used wherever there was no Engligh translation, I availed myself fully of the splendid translation of the Kirchliche Dogmatik carried on under the supervision of G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. It is my feeling that Bartian study carried on in the English speaking world in the future will increasingly avail itself of this monumental work of translation.

Finally a word of appreciation is in order to those who helped make this study possible. I wish to express my thanks to the members of the Theology Department under whom the work of these past three years has been done, and particularly to my advisor Dr. Hendry, whose influence is quite in evidence in the approach taken in this thesis, and under whose patient guidance theological study has been a rich and rewarding experience. Also, I will always be indebted to the Lily Foundation for their generous grant which allowed me to work uninterruptedly on this study. Last, but not least, my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my wife and parents, without whose continual help and support this study would never have been possible.

P.G.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

I. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM 1

The Problem as Posed by Scripture 1
A brief Survey of the Problem in the History of Theological Thought 4
The Problem as it Comes to Focus in the Barth-Bultmann Controversy 16

Part I. THE RELATIONSHIP OF OBJECTIVE TO SUBJECTIVE IN BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF RECONCILIATION

Chapter

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF BARTH'S THOUGHT IN VOLUME IV/1: JESUS CHRIST, THE LORD AS SERVANT .. 25

The Structure of Barth's Doctrine of Reconciliation as a Whole 25
The Deity of Jesus Christ 30
The Work of Jesus Christ as True God ... 41
The Resurrection as the Bridge between Christology and Anthropology 61
Sin as Man's Pride 66
The Justification of Man 70
The Participation of Man in the Event of Reconciliation 79

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF BARTH'S THOUGHT IN VOLUME IV/2: JESUS CHRIST, THE SERVANT AS LORD ... 84

The Humanity of Jesus Christ 84
The Work of Jesus Christ as True Man ... 97
The Holy Spirit as the Bridge Between Christology and Anthropology 104
Sin as Man's Sloth 109
The Sanctification of Man 112
The Participation of Man in the Event of Reconciliation 117

Chapter Page

IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF BARTH'S THOUGHT IN VOLUME IV/3: JESUS CHRIST, THE TRUE WITNESS. 121

The Person of Jesus Christ 121
The Work of Jesus Christ 128
The *Parousia* as the Bridge between Christology and Anthropology 134
Sin as Man's Lie 140
The Calling of Man 141
The Participation of Man in the Event of Reconciliation 143
General Conclusions 144

Part II. THE CLARIFICATION OF BARTH'S SOLUTION FROM OTHER SECTIONS OF HIS DOGMATIC WORK

Chapter

V. BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF SIN AND EVIL AND OF HUMAN FREEDOM, AS DEVELOPED IN VOLUMES III/1 AND III/3 148

Review of Barth's Doctrine of Sin 148
Questions Concerning the Adequacy of this Solution 151
The view of sin Presented in Volume III/1 153
The Doctrine of Freedom that Emerges from this Framework 157
More Elucidation on Sin and Freedom in Volume III/3 160

VI. BARTH'S VIEW OF MAN IN RELATION TO THE PROBLEM OF THIS STUDY 171

The Attempt to Derive Anthropology from Christology 171
The Development of this Approach in Barth's Anthropology 178
The Understanding of Human Subjectivity in Barth's Anthropology 181
Criticism of this Approach 183
Barth's Understanding of Human Spirit ... 192
Criticism of this Approach to Human Spirit 194

Chapter Page

VII. BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN RELATION TO THE PROBLEM OF THIS STUDY 198

The Importance of this Particular Doctrine 198
A Brief Survey of the Place of This Doctrine in Barth's Dogmatics 200
Jesus Christ, the Electing God and the Elected Man 204
Criticism of this Approach 211
The Election of Jesus Christ in its Relation to the Community and to Mankind 216
Problems which Arise from this Doctrine.. 226
1. The Question of Apokatastasis 227
2. The Implicit Mechanism of this System 230
3. The Devalutation of the Church 233

VIII. GENERAL EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS 239

An Attempt to see the Overall Intent of Barth's Theological System 239
1. In Relation to His Interpretation of Mozart 241
2. In Relation to His Essay on Hegel 246
3. In Relation to His Evaluation of the Supralapsarian-Infralapsarian Controversy 254
The Two Great Questions Raised by Barth's Solution, in Relation to the Specific Problem of this Thesis 259
1. The Otherness of the Creature 260
2. The Value of Human Decision 264
Final Concluding Remarks 266

Chapter I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM OF THIS STUDY

One of the recurring problems in theological study is the relation between the Person and Work of Jesus Christ and the appropriation of that which Jesus Christ is and does in the life of the individual person. Traditionally this problem has been variously described as the problem of the relation between the objective reconciliation and the subjective experiencing of this objective event, or as the relation between christology and soteriology, or of the relation between grace and faith, or of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ and the Witness of the Holy Spirit (Calvin) or of Christ the Redeemer and the manner in which fellowship with the perfection and blessedness of the Redeemer expresses itself in the individual man (Schleiermacher).

This particular problem can with right be called one of the crucial problems in theology, as it deals with the very heart of the Biblical revelation itself: God's turning to man and man's response to the God who so turns to him. Out of the heat and fury of the centuries of debate on this question have arisen the various epitaphs of 'Pelagian,' 'Semi-Pelagian,' 'Moralist,' 'Universalist,' etc. etc., an unfortunate fact in that much of this name calling and labeling casts a pall over a serious discussion of this question.

This problem, as we have said, is posed to us by Scripture, and is posed in a most irritating fashion for one who wishes to find a logical solution to it, in that the work of Christ is spoken of in a most objective fashion while at the same time the need for subjective appropriation on the part of the hearer of this message is vigorously stressed. This can be illustrated in brief from some of the best known texts of the New Testament:

a. John 3:16 - "For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life."[1] Does the 'whoever' condition God's love for the world or does it merely indicate the subjective realisation of that which has been brought about by the fact of God's loving the world and sending His Son, i.e., whoever believes knows that eternal life is God's gift to the world?

b. II Corinthians 5:17-21:

> Therefore, if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation, the old has passed away, behold, the new has come. All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation. So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God. For our sake he

---

[1] All quotations from the Bible are taken from The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York, 1952.

> made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in
> him we might become the righteousness of God.

Does the 'if any one is in Christ' speak about a possibility to which man must respond, or is it a possibility which is actualised for every man in that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself; and what does the appeal to be reconciled to God mean? Is it an appeal simply to awake to the reality of being reconciled in Christ, or is the act of reconciliation contingent upon their being reconciled to God in response to God's reconciliation of the world?

c. I Timothy 4:10 - "For to this end we toil and strive, because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe." Does the writer mean that God is the Saviour of all men in possibility and of those who believe in reality, or that He is the Saviour of all men in reality and especially of those who believe in that they are awake to this reality?

d. Or on a wider context, how is one to understand the sweeping statements of Paul in his letters concerning the meaning of Christ to men, e.g. Colossians 1:13,14, and the exhortations which he sets before his readers, e.g. Ephesians 5:1,2? Are such statements made on the presupposition that those to whom he writes have placed faith in Jesus Christ and are therefore within the sphere where what he speaks of is a reality, or are these general privileges and responsibilities of which the Christians knows and to which they respond whereas the non-Christians though they too are in Christ and recipients of His call, are unknowing and unresponsive to it?

Such examples could be cited ad infinitum but these are sufficient to elucidate the nature of the problem and its foundation in the Biblical record itself.

However, as we have also said, the history of theology itself is distinctly marked with attempts to solve this basic problem through various views on the nature of reconciliation which stress either one side or the other of this problem. Either the 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself' aspect or the 'be reconciled to God,' aspect of this event is made the paramount factor in interpreting the event itself.

Generally, these two approaches to understanding the event of reconciliation have been designated as 'objective' and 'subjective' interpretations - the 'objective' concentrating on the aspect of reconciliation as that which happens through God's activity independent of man's participation or response to it, and the 'subjective' stressing the change which takes place in the individual in his relationship to God. Actually as with most labeling and classifying, there is a certain over-simplification involved, but nevertheless these designations are useful.

The objective views of the event of reconciliation can be further broken down into two main types: those which stress the divine action as that which is paramount throughout and as the factor which brings about the reconciliation of man, and those which stress the divine action as the initiating force which allows Jesus Christ, the God-man, to effect a change in the relationship between God and man in His activity as a man.[2]

The first type has been designated by Gustaf Aulen as the Classic view, which he sees as dominating the church through its early history up to the time of Anselm. Furthermore it is Aulen's contention that this viewpoint was that advocated by Luther and that it is the view which genuinely expresses the New Testament message concerning reconciliation.[3] Jesus Christ is the divine Warrior who enters into the human situation and conquers the powers which have enslaved man - the devil, sin, corruption, death, etc., and in this victory won by Him, reconciliation takes place.

The second type, expressed in its classical form by Anselm and designated by Aulen as the Latin theory, sees reconciliation as being wrought on the part of Jesus Christ in terms of what He does as a man in the place of other men. Thus Christ pays the debt to God's honor that man must pay but is unable to pay on his own (Anselm), or He suffers the penalty for man's sin that man must suffer but is incapable of bearing (Calvin), or He confesses the righteousness of the divine wrath and claims the love of God which is there in the bosom of the Father and deeper than His wrath (Campbell), or He presents to God a perfect racial obedience, entering into the wrath of God and praising God's holiness (Forsyth).

---

[2] Aulen, Gustaf, Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement; trans. by A. C. Herbert, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1954, p. 5.

[3] Ibid., p. 6.

On the other hand the subjective views of the atonement see the essential thing not as taking place in Christ's struggle with evil or in the removal of the obstacle posed by God's justice to His love, but in the transformation and change in the understanding and will of the individual. God's love as it is revealed and manifested in Jesus Christ causes the individual to love God and in this his love for God reconciliation takes place (Abelard), or reconciliation happens as the individual's sense of God grows stronger, in the experience of blessedness which follows on a deepened consciousness of God (Schleiermacher), or it happens as the misconception concerning God's character is removed (Ritschl), or it takes place purely in terms of the power it wields in human character (Bushnell).

The onesidedness of these viewpoints is quite evident. The so-called 'Classical' view tends to see reconciliation as something that takes place over the head of man, and it is difficult to see how any important place can be given to the subjective experience of man. If man's problem is in the situation in which he finds himself and if the work of Jesus Christ is to alter this situation, liberating man from the powers that control him, then reconciliation takes place completely in this event in which Jesus Christ triumphs and the most that can be left to the experience of man is to take knowledge of this victory and live in its light, but whether he does or not, reconciliation is in force, it is a *fait accompli* in and of itself. Paul Tillich is quite correct in his observation that the *Christus Victor* symbol used by Aulen as a description of the event of reconciliation could have arisen only as the result of the experiencing of God's love, the conquest of one's own existential estrangement, and that therefore it is wrong to treat it in such an exclusively objective way.[4]

The same charge can be made against the Latin theory as developed by Anselm. Here our primary concern is not with the worth of this theory in itself, with its obvious shortcomings and deficiencies, but with its extreme objectivity. In Cur Deus Homo? where his doctrine of the atonement is set forth, Anselm makes at the most only a passing reference to the problem of appropriation in chapter nineteen and this is more in regards to the question of how the superabundant reward the Son receives from the Father for His death can apply to other men, rather than to the question of man's participation in this act.[5] Or the same difficulty comes out in a more modern work like Forsyth's. According to Forsyth, reconciliation takes place in Jesus Christ and His Cross once for all, it is "really effected in the spiritual world in such a way that in history the great victory is not still to be won, it has been won in reality, and has only to be followed up and secured in actuality."[6] The obvious question to be asked is what is the distinction between reality and actuality; are not these practically synonymous terms, or at the most is not the difference between them of a noetic character?

---

[4] Tillich, Paul, *Systematic Theology: Volume II, Existence and the Christ*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, p. 171.

On the other hand the deficiencies of the 'subjective' views are quite apparent. Though they stress, and quite rightly stress, that in the event of reconciliation something happens in the life of man, they limit reconciliation just to this experience and the implications that must be drawn from it concerning Jesus Christ. There is no real encounter, no meeting between God and man in which something happens both from the side of God and the side of man, but man awakens to the truth about God that is from eternity to eternity, namely that He is love, or he begins to develop a capacity latent within him, and in this experience reconciliation takes place. Man is reconciled to the God from whom he never in fact was alienated, the cloud of his ignorance is dispersed.

---

[5] Anselm, St., Cur Deus Homo; trans. by Sidney Deane, La Salle, Illinois, The Open Court Publishing Company, 1954, pp. 283-286.

[6] Forsyth, Peter T., The Work of Christ, London, Independent Press, 1938, p. 77.

Notwithstanding this general division of theories of the atonement into objective and subjective classifications, there have been attempts throughout the history of doctrine to see these two elements as both integral and vital to a right understanding of the one event of reconciliation. For example Thomas Aquinas' treatment of this subject is most interesting. In a section on the effects of Christ's passion in the Summa Theologica he combines together many of the various views of the atonement: Christ's passion delivers us from sin, delivers us from the devil's power, frees us from the punishment of sin, reconciles us to God, and opens the gate of heaven to us.[7] All this He effects for us as the Head of the

---

[7] Thomas Aquinas, St., Summa Theologica: First and Complete American Edition in three volumes; translated by

Church and of all men, yet this does not make salvation a gift which automatically is the inheritance of every man, but rather man must participate in Him for salvation to be effective, which participation comes through the receiving of the sacraments.[8]

With Luther and Calvin we have the same emphasis - a stress on the importance and objectivity of Christ's work, while at the same time an insistence on man's participation in Christ for this to be a reality.[9] Calvin is quite emphatic on this point: Christ, by the whole course of His obedience destroyed the enmity between God and us and procured a righteousness which renders Him favorable and propitious to us. Especially is this seen in His death where a complete atonement was made by His sacrifice so that we need no longer fear the divine wrath. One could not find a statement that stresses the objectivity of man's reconciliation in the work of Jesus Christ more than this:

> Since we see that the whole of our salvation, and all the branches of it, are comprehended in Christ, we must be cautious not to alienate

---

[7] Fathers of the English Dominican Province; New York, Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1947; Pt. 3; Q49, Arts. 1-5, pp. 2287-2293.

[8] *Ibid*., Pt. III, Q. 61, Art. 1, p. 2352, 5.

[9] In regards to Luther's view, see Luther, Martin, *Large Catechism*, trans. by J. N. Lenker, Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1935, Section 154, pp. 121, 122.

> from him the least possible portion of it. If we seek salvation, we are taught by the name of JESUS, that it is in him; if we seek any other gifts of the Spirit, they will be found in his unction; strength, in his dominion; purity, in his conception; indulgence discovers itself in his nativity, by which he was made to resemble us in all things, that he might learn to condole with us; if we seek redemption, it will be found in his passion; absolution, in his condemnation; remission of the curse, in his cross; satisfaction, in his sacrifice; purification, in his blood; reconciliation, in his descent into hell; mortification of the flesh, in his sepulchre; newness of life and immortality, in his resurrection; the inheritance of the celestial kingdom, in his entrance into heaven; protection, security, abundance, and enjoyment of all blessings, in his kingdom; a fearless expectation of the judgment, in the judgicial authority committed to him.[10]

But alongside of the fact that reconciliation is complete and perfect in Christ, Calvin turns immediately to the question of how this reaches and effects man, stressing that unless a man is 'in Christ', unless the Holy Spirit unites the believer with Christ through faith "all that he suffered and performed for the salvation of mankind is useless and unavailing to us."[11] The whole of the third book of the Institutes is given to a description of faith and the way it is experienced in the Christian life.

---

[10] Calvin, John, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. by John Allen, 6th American edition, in 2 vols., Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, Vol. I, II, XVI, 19.

[11] Ibid., III, 1, 1, p. 484.

The Heidelberg Catechism is a good example of the emphasis on both objective and subjective elements that was common to the reformers. After building up to the need of a Mediator for man's salvation, question 18 asks, "But who is that Mediator, who is at the same time true God and a true, righteous Man?", to which the answer is given, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who is given unto us for complete redemption and righteousness."[12] But when the questioner seeks to draw a universal implication from this in question 20 - "Are all men, then, restored by Christ, as they perished by Adam?" he is given the answer, "No, but only those who through true faith are incorporated into Him, and receive all His benefits."[13]

Again questions 60 and 61 illustrate this point:

> Q. 60. How are you righteous before God?
> A. Only through true faith in Jesus Christ; wherefore although my conscience already accuses me that I have grievously sinned against all the commandments of God, and have not kept any one of them, and that I am still ever prone to all evil, yet God, without any merit of my own, out of sheer grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ, as if I had never committed nor had a single sin, and had myself accomplished all the obedience which Christ has fulfilled for me, if only I receive such a benefit with a believing heart.

---

[12] Torrance, Thomas, The School of Faith: the Catechisms of the Reformed Church; The Heidelberg Catechism of 1563, London, James Clarke & Co., Limited, 1959, p.71.

[13] Ibid., p. 72.

> Q. 61. Why do you say that you are righteous by faith alone?
> A. Not because I please God on account of the worthiness of my faith; but because the satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ alone is my righteousness before God, and because I can receive it and make it my own in no other way than by faith alone.[14]

Thus it seems fair to say that in theology there has always been a tradition which sees reconciliation as taking place neither in Christ alone, nor in the attitude of man alone, but in the relationship between Christ and sinful men. And one can go further and say that for the most part, contemporary theology - at least that part of it which is not concerned with idolizing past tradition - views the solution of this problem as lying within this third alternative which seeks to give both objective and subjective factors their rightful importance. The concept of a personal relationship is seen as providing a key to express in a more understandable way that which the Reformers and others expressed paradoxically, for a personal relationship is made up of objective and subjective factors which cannot be torn apart and examined in isolation without destroying the very essence of what is involved in such a relationship.

For example consider the work of Paul Tillich, George Hendry, Donald Baillie and Emil Brunner on this subject. Although each theologian attacks this problem from his own particular vantage point, each agrees that reconciliation is an event in which both objective and subjective elements are indissolubly bound together. Thus for Paul Tillich, reconciliation takes place in the appearance of the New Being overcoming the forces of existential estrangement, and man's participation in the New Being, that is, participation in the divine participation, accepting it and being transformed by it.[15] George Hendry sees the atonement as taking place in the relation of Christ to sinful men, in the gift of forgiveness bestowed by Christ and in the receiving of this gift by men, "Surely it is here in the relation between God and man that the decisive aspect of the atonement must be seen, and surely it is in terms of personal relationship that its ultimate mystery must be expressed."[16] For Donald Baillie reconciliation is not completed outside of human life or behind our backs but is a spiritual process in the realm of personal relationships; "the objective work cannot be separated from its subjective aspect by which it becomes a reality in the hearts and lives of men."[17]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 80.

---

[15] Tillich, op. cit., v. 2., p. 176.

[16] Hendry, George, The Gospel of the Incarnation; Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1958, p. 131.

[17] Baillie, Donald, God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955, p. 200.

Finally, Emil Brunner refers to reconciliation as an event that is both objective and subjective, referring back to the New Testament which always regards both the atoning event and faith as indissolubly united, as a truth of encounter.[18]

In all approaches of this type to an understanding of the event of reconciliation, reconciliation is seen as initiated and brought into man's life entirely by God, as coming solely from His grace and love, but nevertheless having a contingent element which is basic to every personal relationship. Reconciliation does not take place apart from the human response to it, and even though this human response is awakened by the Holy Spirit, unless it be conceived as some sort of divine monologue, it is still a human response in which man's total life is involved. Reconciliation does not take place simply in Christ's coming and in what He does, but in the relation of His Person and Work to the lives of men and thus a distinction must be drawn between His Person and Work and the response to it in terms of possibility and actuality, or of offer and reception.

---

[18] Brunner, Emil, The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, Dogmatics: Vol. 2, trans. by Olive Wyon, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1952, p. 290.

The particular aim of this thesis is to examine the thought of Karl Barth on this subject. As is second nature with Barth he gives to this subject, as to all the traditional subjects of theology, his own particular stamp, and this is what makes such a study of his thought a profitable and exciting task.

Barth's position in broad outline can be characterised as an attempt to mediate between the traditional objective views of the atonement and the more modern attempts which seek to express the importance of the subjective side of the event of reconciliation. It may be surprising to some critics of Barth to find that he is concerned with this problem, or that he attempts a solution in which he gives to subjective appropriation, to human faith, a place. Barth's theology is often pictured as rolling along in splendid isolation concerned with God and God alone, but such a caricature is wrong. The titles of some of his latest tracts - The Humanity of God or Humanism, - or an understanding of the christological method which he has used consistently throughout the Kirchliche Dogmatik, should be fair warning to all those who would write him off as a misanthrope. Whether one can accept the view of human subjectivity in relation to God's act in Christ or not, is a question that will confront us continually in this study, but that Barth has a definite view of human subjectivity, that the human subject has an important place in his thought, simply cannot be denied.

However, in his formulation Barth rejects the distinction between the possibility of reconciliation present in Christ and its actuality which takes place in the relation of Christ and those men who respond to Him in faith, which at first glance seems inevitable if one is to take both the objective and subjective aspects of reconciliation seriously. According to Barth this distinction makes reconciliation an uncertain event, whereas in Jesus Christ it is a reality whose certitude cannot be doubted or made subject to any human contingency. In one sense his whole doctrine of reconciliation can be viewed as a gigantic attempt to do justice to the subjective side of reconciliation without allowing this event to be drawn into the contingency which seems inevitable in such an endeavor.

This emphasis of Barth comes out particularly in his attitude toward Rudolf Bultmann. Barth sees Bultmann's position as the logical and inevitable outcome of any attempt to draw a distinction between the possibility and actuality of reconciliation. In the introduction of the first volume on reconciliation he refers to the fact that he finds himself "in an intensive, although for the most part quiet, debate with Rudolf Bultmann," that his subject is always present before him and that though he respects Bultmann he chooses to follow a way contrary to him, a way that will involve 'obscure conceptuality.'[19]

Barth is quite correct when he refers to this as a quiet debate in that he refers to Bultmann by name only twelve times throughout the first three volumes of his doctrine of reconciliation, a quantity of some 3,000 pages. Perhaps the clearest indication of that which he opposes in Bultmann's thought comes in a note near the beginning of section 59,3. (C.D. IV, 1, p. 284.) Actually in this particular excursus, G. Thomasius' work Christi Person und Werk is the main object of Barth's attack but he sees in this work tendencies that have come to fruition in Bultmann.

What Barth objects to in Thomasius' work is just that which we have been speaking about above, the distinction between an objective reconciliation in which humanity has become the object of God's grace, in which the actual possibility (Moglichkeit), the right and power to be reconciled with God is won for the individual members of the race and which has to become an actuality (Wirklichkeit) in the individual appropriation of this possibility. He violently rejects the description of this antithesis in terms of possibility and actuality, for from such a distinction it is just one step away from speaking of the differentiation of a purpose which is only present in Jesus Christ and which purpose attains its goal only in some other occurrence.[20]

---

[19] C. D., IV/1, p. ix.

For Barth there can be no room for a cramping 'only' in relation to the atonement made in Jesus Christ, and it is just this cramping only that Bultmann develops in the present day. He quotes from Bultmann's Theology of the New Testament (E.T. 1952, I, p. 252) "'By Christ there has been created nothing more than the possibility of zoe, which does, of course, become an assured actuality in those that believe.'"[21] Barth concludes: "This is the very thing which will not do."[22]

In a pamphlet published one year earlier (1952), on Bultmann, Barth gives in a more developed form the criticism we have summarised here. He interprets Bultmann as teaching that the kerygma concerns primarily a double determination of man; an old determination which is revealed by the kerygma, and a new determination to which man is summoned by the proclamation of the kerygma, with the going over from the old being to the new, the act of faith and obedience, being equated to the Christ-event, for in this going over the Heilstat of God is fulfilled.

Bultmann in this presentation seeks to see christology and soteriology as a unity, but according to Barth, christology is absorbed into soteriology in that Christ is made merely the presupposition of the essential act which takes place when the experiencing subject through faith and obedience crosses over from his old existence to his future existence.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 285.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

In such a presentation of the kerygma, the cross and resurrection are central for Bultmann, but as Barth interprets him, central only to the extent that they take on meaning in the proclamation of the kerygma and in the obedience of faith. The Cross which has reference to the historical crucifixion of Jesus Christ only has meaning as a man accepts the judgment of death and moves on to the new eschatological existence, and the resurrection is really the noetic aspect of the cross in that its meaningfulness is realised and understood and affirmed in faith.

Barth's objection to this thought is not that it is false to the New Testament but that it reverses the correct order found therein. Rather than looking on the kerygma as Christ, the New Testament message is that Christ is the kerygma. Whereas there is a unity of christology and soteriology in the New Testament, its unity is found in the real Christ-event. "Sodass die eine Geschichte, die den Inhalt des Kerygmas bildet, gerade als Christusgeschehen auch das Christusgeschehen,

sodass ihr Ort - gerade der Ort jenes heilsamen Uebergangs vom Alten zum Neuen - eben doch das Leben und Sterben des Mannes Jesus von Nazareth ist."[23]

Then too, the Cross has significance in itself, not only in the obedience of faith, and in fact the obedience of faith is founded in the meaningfulness of the Cross in itself. "Ich meine vielmehr zeichnet und beschrieben wird, das dann als solches und von daher auch im Kerygma und für den Glauben von dessen Hörern bedeutsam werden kann und mag."[24]

The Cross has this meaning in itself because of the Person who was crucified there, for the crucified Jesus Christ is not just any crucified Person, which could be the implication one gets from Bultmann's lack of concern over the Person of Christ, "sondern eben Er ist; Gott, als der sich selbst zum Knecht erniedrigende Herr, Mensch als der von Gott zum Herrn erhöhte Knecht, der legitimierte und sich selbst legitimierende Zeuge und Prophet des Gottesreiches."[25] And this Person has not merely inaugurated a movement but He has suffered for all men the saving judgment of death and has fulfilled already for all men their going over from the old essence to the new. In

---

[23] Barth, K., Rudolf Bultmann: Ein Versuch, ihm zu verstehen; Theologische Studien, Heft 34, Zollikon, Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., 1952, p. 18.

[24] Ibid., p. 20.

[25] Ibid., p. 21.

Him, "diesen Prozess also nicht nur inauguriert, sondern abgeschlossen hat."[26]

Finally, for Barth the resurrection cannot be seen only as the perception of the meaningfulness of the crucifixion, but it speaks primarily about Jesus Christ Himself and as such about His own life from and after death, His witness to Himself, His concrete encounter with the not-yet-believing disciples.[27] As we will shortly see it is these very emphases made here in opposition to Bultmann that Barth develops in his doctrine of reconciliation.

The question of whether Barth interprets Bultmann aright in this presentation is really secondary in view of the purpose of this paper. The important thing to see is that which Barth is consciously reacting against in regard to Bultmann, and from this cursory survey this is quite apparent. In Bultmann he sees a reappearance of the old Liberal theology which had its father in Schleiermacher, in which the experiencing individual is made the norm and center of dogmatics and God in Christ is relegated to the periphery which stands as the presupposition to this central event. With Bultmann theology once again has become absorbed in the sphere of anthropology, and for Barth, in agreement with the dicta of Feuerbach, whose thought seems to haunt him persistently in his work, when theology becomes absorbed in the anthropological sphere then it ought simply to throw off its mask and proclaim itself as pure anthropology.[28]

---

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid., p. 23.

As to the substance of Barth's evaluation of Bultmann, one can briefly say that he has put his finger on one of the most questionable features of Bultmann's theology. Christological formulations for him are the description of the encounter in which man passes from his old existence for the world to his new existence for God, but they have no validity or standing or objectivity outside this event of faith.[29] Even those critics who are sympathetic with the main thrust of Bultmann's theological work find this aspect of his thought a stone which causes them much stumbling.[30] With these brief introductory remarks we will pass on to the main substance of this work, the presentation of Barth's thought on this subject.

---

[28] For Barth's view on Feuerbach see his essay on same in Die Protestantische Theologie im 19.Jahrhundert; ihre Vorgeschicte und ihre Geschicte Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., 1944; and introductory essay to Feuerbach's Essence of Christianity, trans. by George Eliot, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1957.

[29] For example see Bultmann, Rudolf, The Christological Confession in Essays, Philosophical and Theological, The Library of Philosophy and Theology, trans. by James Greig, New York, MacMillan, 1955; New Testament Mythology in Bartsch, Kerygma and Myth, trans. by Reginald Fuller, London, S.P.C.K., 1953, p. 41; or Theology of the New Testament, trans. by Kendrick Groben, 2 volumes, New York, Scribners, 1951, 1955, v. 1, p. 302.

---

[30] For example, see Macquarrie, John, An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann; London, S.C.M. Press, Ltd., especially pp. 177-192 and 242-246.

Part I - THE RELATIONSHIP OF OBJECTIVITY TO SUBJECTIVITY IN BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF RECONCILIATION.

Chapter II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF BARTH'S THOUGHT IN VOLUME IV/1: JESUS CHRIST, THE LORD AS SERVANT

In our study of Barth we will begin and concentrate upon his treatment of this question in his doctrine of reconciliation, as this is where we find his most recent thought, and more important, here it is that this question comes to sharp focus. Barth himself has emphasised the importance of this doctrine in the whole of his work with the comment: "to fail here is to fail everywhere."[1] We will, however, also make reference to other formulations of Barth's thought on this subject especially as it is developed in his doctrines of creation, of man and of election. Once this exposition has been made we will seek to evaluate the proposed solution in itself and in relation to the theological tradition.

The point of departure will be volume IV, 1, section 59, 2, The Judge Judged in our Place, which is where Barth develops the work of Christ in relation to His deity, or what has traditionally been spoken of as the High-Priestly work of Christ. First, however, a brief resume should be made of the structure of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation as a whole and also of the content of section 59,1.

---

[1] C.D., IV/1, p. ix.

The scope of this work can perhaps best be seen by means of a diagramatic arrangement of the *Leit* sentence of section 58, taken from Otto Weber's *Karl Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik*:[2]

"Der Inhalt der Lehre von der Versöhnung ist:

die Erkenntnis *Jesu Christi*, der

(1)	(2)	(3)
der wahre, nämlich der sich selbst erniedrigende und so der versöhnende Gott, aber	auch der wahre, nämlich der von Gott erhöhte und so versöhnte Mensch, und der in Einheit beider	der Bürge und Zeuge unserer Versöhnung ist.

In dieser dreifachen Erkenntnis Jesu Christi ist beschlossen

die Erkenntnis von des Menschen *Sünde*:

(1) seines Hochmuts,	(2) seiner Trägheit,	(3) seiner Lüge-

die Erkenntnis des Geschehens, in welchem sich seine Versöhnung *vollzieht*:

(1) seiner Rechtfertigung,	(2) seiner Heiligung,	(3) seiner Berufung

die Erkenntnis des Werkes des *Heiligen Geistes*: in der

(1) Sammlung,	(2) Auferbauung	(3) Sendung

der *Gemeinde* und

des Seins der *Christen* in Jesus Christus

(1) im Glauben,	(2) in der Liebe,	(3) in der Hoffnung.

The first general comment on this structure is the extent of that which is covered by Barth in his doctrine of reconciliation. He has brought together here in this one doctrine that which is the content of Books II, III, and Iv of Calvin's Institutes, of what is traditionally designated as christology, soteriology and ecclesiology.

---

[2] Weber, Otto, *Karl Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik: Ein einfuhrender Bericht zu der Banden I,1 bis IV, 2*, Kreis Moers, Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen, 1958, pp. 196,197.

In close connection with this first observation is the fact that christology dominates the content of this doctrine completely. Barth rejects the traditional framework mentioned above because it makes of christology only one doctrine among many, a procedure which inevitably leads to the tendency to emphasise soteriology and ecclesiology as that which is existentially relevant. Instead, christological propositions "must be represented and thought of as the statement from which all truth derives, which control the whole nexus, which themselves constitute and reveal this nexus."[3] This is true even of the doctrine of sin, which cannot be treated as preceding reconciliation but rather must be seen from the point of man's conversion to God as the presupposition of why man has need for this conversion.

Concerning the question of christology itself, it is of importance to see the manner in which Barth formulates his christology. The Person and Work of Christ are seen as a unity which cannot be divided. The being of

---

[3] C.D., IV/1, p. 125.

Jesus Christ is the history of the unity of the living God and this living man, the content of which history is reconciliation. The question, 'who say men that I am?', that of His Person, is answered directly within the speech, action, living and suffering and dying of the New Testament Christ, by His Work.[4]

That which takes place in this history in essence is the humbling of the Deity in that He becomes man, the condescension of the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father; and the exaltation of man to the side of God, for in that God became like man, so man has become like God - He is exalted by the humiliation of God.

Thus the doctrine of the two natures and two states have been brought together in a way that marks an innovation, for instead of seeing them as two successive states - His state of humiliation followed by His state of exaltation - he sees them as two sides or directions of what took place in Jesus Christ for the reconciliation of man with God. This is His being - humiliation and exaltation - the actuality of Jesus Christ as the very God who humbles Himself and the man who is exalted.

The fact that Jesus Christ is the active subject in this history, that in Him the humiliated God and exalted man are One, that He is the God-man, means that He Himself attests the reconciliation that takes place in this event of humiliation and exaltation. He is the pledge of it in His existence, its actuality, the truth of it that speaks out, and in this consists His prophetic office and its implications for the anthropological sphere in terms of man's calling, the sending of the community and the hope of the Christian man. Thus Barth seeks to give to the prophetic office of Christ, brought to prominence by Calvin, but relegated to a rather insignificant role in relation to His other two offices, a completely new direction and make it of equal value and importance to His high-priestly and kingly offices.

---

[4] *Ibid*., p. 127.

One final observation on this structure concerns the place given to the subjective response of man to reconciliation, which takes place within the sphere of the Church. This which for Schleiermacher was the starting point and which for Calvin was of equal importance and significance as the objective aspects of his soteriology, has for Barth a definitely subordinate importance. That which is of primary importance is the reconciliation of the world - that which takes place properly in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ - and which is pronounced objectively to the world in terms of justification, sanctification and calling. This is so because it is in Jesus Christ Himself that man's justification, sanctification and calling is true and actual, and thus applicable to all men. "In the Christian there is an appropriation of the grace of God ascribed to all men in Jesus Christ, a subjective apprehension of what has been done for the whole world in the happening of atonement."[5]

What distinguishes the Christian from the non-Christian is that he has eyes and ears and sense and reason and a heart that are open to Jesus Christ and ready for Him, a fact brought about by His Holy Spirit. "The Word of God is spoken to all. God's verdict and direction and promise have been pronounced over all. To that extent, objectively, all are justified, sanctified and called. But the hand of God has not touched all in such a way that they can see and hear, perceive and accept and receive all that God is for all and therefore for them, how therefore they can exist and think and live."[6]

In this survey of the doctrine of reconciliation as a whole, the direction of Barth's thought on the problem of this paper is already indicated and it is to a fuller expansion of this thought that we now turn.

As we have seen from this survey, the first aspect of reconciliation concerns the humiliation of the true God in His becoming man, the movement Barth describes under the chapter heading: Jesus Christ, The Lord as Servant, and more properly under the christological section as: the obedience of the Son of God. This section in turn is divided into three subsections - the way of the Son of God into the far country, or what could be called the doctrine of the deity of Christ; the Judge judged in our place, or the doctrine of that which God does in becoming flesh; and the verdict of the Father, which serves as a transitional section in that it establishes a positive relation between the christological and anthropological spheres through a consideration of the resurrection. As we have said our concern is primarily with sub-section two, but a word about Barth's exposition of the deity of Christ is here in order.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 147.

[6] Ibid., p. 148.

The substance of Barth's thought on the deity of Jesus Christ is found in the rather startling assertion that the deity of Jesus Christ is to be found exactly in His act of obedience to the Father, in the humbling of Himself and becoming man. Contrary to traditional dogmatic thought which views the Incarnation of the Son as a temporary parenthesis in His exalted and majestic and transcendent being as God, Barth would have us see His deity in no other place than in His becoming man, in His journey into the far country.

At this point Barth is applying rigorously a fundamental assertion he has made throughout his dogmatics on the nature of revelation - that God is in His revelation no other than He is in Himself, that in His *opus ad extra* He is no other than He is in the event of His inner being. With this presupposition, the bold description of the deity of Christ is made necessary, for that which characterises the life of Jesus Christ is "the fact that in relation to God-and therefore to the world as well-this man wills only to be obedient - obedient to the will of the Father, which is done on earth for the redemption of man as it is done in heaven."[7]

This obedience of Jesus Christ is not simply seen in His becoming man, but His becoming Israelite man, His becoming flesh, identifying Himself with sinful humanity and existing under the wrath and judgment of the electing and loving God, affirming the divine sentence on man and allowing it to be fulfilled on Him. It is this giving, this condescending, this humbling in this way, the content of which we will shortly study, that is the mystery of the deity of Christ.[8]

For Barth, there is no other alternative than to see the deity of Christ in His obedience, for to do otherwise would be to speak of His act of humiliation as something outside of His being, it would mean that in the

---

[7] *Ibid*., p. 164.

[8] *Ibid*., p. 177.

Incarnation there was a de-divinisation of God. But this would simply rob the statement that 'God was in Christ' of any positive meaning whatsoever. To say that God is truly and altogether in Christ "tells us that God for His part is God in His unity with this creature, this man, in His human and creaturely nature-and this without ceasing to be God, without any alteration or diminution of His divine nature."[9]

But when one accepts this alternative then he is left with the two possibilities of viewing the Incarnation as a novum mysterium, an absolute paradox noetically and ontically, as a cleft or rift or gulf in God, or of seeing that God is true to Himself in this condescension. For Barth this latter alternative is the only real choice open for in God "there is no paradox, no antinomy, no division, no inconsistency, not even the possibility of it."[10]

Thus the traditional views of God's immutability must be burst open in order to include this possibility in His unalterable being. God is infinite, exalted, active, impassible, transcendent, but He is all this as the Lord, in such a way that He embraces the opposites of these concepts even while He is superior to them.

---

[9] Ibid., p. 183.

[10] Ibid., p. 186.

Therefore, God can act towards the world "in an absolute way and also a relative, in an infinite and also a finite, in an exalted and also a lowly, in an active and also a passive, in a transcendent and also an immanent, and finally in a divine and also a human - indeed, in relation to which He Himself can become wordly, making His own both its form, the forma servi and also its cause; and all without giving up His own form, the forma Dei, and His own glory, but adopting the form and cause of man into the most perfect communion with His own, accepting solidarity with the world. God can do this."[11]

But this fact, that God acts in this way ad extra, is, as we have seen, grounded in the fact that He is this in Himself, and so one must go on to say, "that for God it is just as natural to be lowly as it is to be high, to be near as it is to be far, to be little as it is to be great, to be abroad as it is to be at home."[12] The truth and actuality of our atonement depend on the fact that as God exists and speaks and acts in Jesus Christ, He exists and speaks and acts as the One He was from all eternity and will be to all eternity.[13] From the fact that the true God is the acting subject in the reconciliation of the world and that the presence and action of Jesus Christ is God Himself and truly Himself in His acting and intervening in the world, one must "accept the humiliation and lowliness and supremely the obedience of Christ as the dominating moment in our conception of God."[14]

---

[11] Ibid., p. 187.

[12] Ibid., p. 192.

[13] Ibid., p. 193.

Therefore, in God Himself there is an above (Oben) and a below (Unten), a *prius* and a *posterius*, a superiority (Vorordnung) and a subordination (Nachordnung). Rather than this being a denial of His unity, His divine unity consists precisely in the fact that He is both One who is obeyed and Another who obeys. Thus when He allows the creature to co-exist with Him, this is pure grace, superfluity, an overflowing of His perfection, for all the creation could offer to Him - its otherness, its being in antithesis to Himself and therefore His own existence as co-existence - God has Himself as God, as the original and essential determination of His being and life as God.[15] Δ

The problem that is posed by this seeming contradiction in the being of God, is solved by the fact that God is more than the One who rules in majesty and obeys in humility, but is also a Third, the One who affirms the

---

[14] *Ibid*., p. 199.

[15] *Ibid*., p. 201.

One and equal Godhead through and by and in the two modes of being, the Holy Spirit who makes possible and maintains His fellowship with Himself as the One and the Other. Thus God is One, the true and living God, whose Godhead consists in this history.[16]

Thus in His turning to man God is giving to man a part in the history in which He is God. This is seen in creation in which there is a reflection in the antithesis between Creator and creature of this history and in the twofoldness of the existence of man in which there is a reflection of the likeness of the inner life of God Himself, but above all in the Incarnation and work of reconciliation, in which the inward divine relationship between the One who rules and commands in majesty and the One who obeys in humility is identical with the very different relationship between God and One of His creatures.[17]

In the act of reconciliation God becomes what He had not previously been, taking into unity with Himself a creaturely and sinful being. But this act has its basis in His own inner being, in His own life and it is done "as the strangely logical final continuation of, the history in which He is God."[18] He is simply activating and revealing Himself ad extra, in the world. "He is in time what He is in eternity (and what He can be also in time because of His eternal being)."[19] He is in our lowliness what He is in His majesty and what He can be also in our lowliness because His majesty is also lowliness."[20]

---

[16] Ibid., p. 203.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

This particular section is of especial importance to the understanding of Barth's trinitarian thought, for his view of God's deity is that His deity includes His humanity. This thought has been more succinctly formulated in the pamphlet The Humanity of God (Die Menschlichkeit Gottes), where Barth asserts that God's deity rightly understood, i.e., from God's binding of Himself to man in Jesus Christ, includes His humanity, that His divinity as such has the character of humanity. God's deity is His superiority, His initiative, but He has His deity in freedom and He uses this freedom to be with and for us, to be humble, to be a servant, to be One who is judged, to be man's brother in time. "In this divinely free volition and election, in this sovereign decision God is human. His free affirmation of man, His free concern for Him, His free substitution for Him - this is God's humanity."[21] This section of Barth's thought just studied provides the explanation of just how such a statement can be made.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 204.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Barth, Karl, The Humanity of God; a translation of Die Menschlichkeit Gottes, trans. by John Thomas, Richmond, Va., John Knox Press, 1960, p. 51.

Also, in seeing the relation of Father and Son as that of majesty and humility, of an above and a below, Barth also seems to be bringing to a focus a point made in the earlier part of his dogmatics, namely that in God's own being and life there is grace. In volume II, 1, he speaks of grace as the very essence of God, the being of God as itself properly and essentially divine. In stating this Barth admitted the inconceivability of such a concept when applied to God's own being: "The form in which grace exists in God Himself and is actual as God is in point hidden from us and incomprehensible to us."[22] He also goes on to say that in God it is real in such a way that there is neither the need nor the capacity for any turning or condescension as is the case when He manifests His grace _ad extra_, but that nevertheless it is real in the life of God for otherwise it would not be a divine reality.[23]

However, in speaking this way Barth has seemed to burst the bonds of conceivability in that he sees the relation of Father and Son reflected analogically in the relation of Creator and creature and in the deity and humanity of Jesus Christ. This is more explicitly brought out in the subsection on the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which event is described as purely the action of God the Father in which the Son is wholly object:

---

[22] _C.D., II/1_, p. 357.

[23] _Ibid_., pp. 357, 8.

> Certainly in the resurrection of Jesus Christ we have to do with a movement and action which took place not merely in human history but first and foremost in God Himself, a movement and action in which Jesus Christ as the Son of God had no less part than in His humiliation to the death of the cross, yet only as a pure object and recipient of the grace of God. We must not be afraid of the apparently difficult thought that as in God Himself (as we have seen), in the relationship of the Son to the Father (the model of all that is demanded from man by God), there is a pure obedience, subordination and subjection, so too in the relationship of the Father to the Son (the model of all that is given to man by God) there is a free and pure grace which as such can only be received, and the historical fulfilment of which is the resurrection of Jesus Christ.[24]

This understanding of the relation of Father and Son, as Arnold Come in his book Human Spirit and Holy Spirit suggests, tends to describe God's being as an inter-personal rather than an intra-personal being and has almost unavoidable tendencies towards tri-theism.[25] Berkouwer in his evaluation of Barth's thought on this point also is quite critical from another point of view, in that he sees Barth as going beyond the limitations put on our thought by the Incarnation, making the point that the death of Christ should also have to be seen as part of the being of God if his reasoning is followed to its logical conclusion.[26]

---

[24] C.D., IV/1, p. 304.

[25] Come, Arnold, Human Spirit and Holy Spirit, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1959, pp. 147-149.

There is no doubt that Barth in his treatment of the deity of Jesus Christ, as was mentioned above, has stretched human conceivability almost to the breaking point. Although not stated explicitly, he has taken up the concepts of an and en hypostasia, which he later describes as necessary in understanding the relationship between deity and humanity in the Person of Jesus Christ, into the being of God Himself, into the relationship of Father and Son. More of this will unfold as our study continues and we will in the concluding section have reason to question this concept and its applicability to the relationship between Jesus Christ and humanity.

That which seems to be behind Barth's thought and what leads him in this direction, is his concern for the truth of revelation, for the fact that God lives His life in His opus ad extra in exactly the same way that He lives in His inner-trinitarian relationships. He fears that any distinction between God in Himself and God as He reveals Himself to us, will only lead eventually to a reduction of theology to the status of where it pronounces mere value judgments, and finally to the place where it is only in reality anthropology. Thus the shadow of Feuerbach seems to haunt him here. The question that comes to mind in all this and which will be discussed at greater length in the critical section of this work, is whether the alternative posed by Barth does not make anthropology into theology, and in effect take away from the reality of God's encounter with man, making man, as Come again suggests, a mode of one of the modes of God's interpersonal being, and also whether Feuerbach were he alive today, or other modern-day 'projectionists' would not see this as the final attempt of theology to cover up the fact that it is anthropology by consigning anthropology to a realm within theology.

---

[26] Berkouwer, G.C. The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth, translated by Harry R. Boer; Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1956, pp. 306, 7.

We now turn to the question of why the Son of God, Jesus Christ, became a servant, why He concretely rendered obedience in this way - the question of Cur Deus Homo?, of the purpose and end that God willed this and does this, the question concerning the work of Christ, His High-Priestly office.

According to Barth it is correct to say in the first place that God did this as an outward activation and revelation of the whole inward riches of His deity in all its height and depth. He so acts "that the world created by Him might have and see within it, in the Son as the image of the Father, its own original, that He wills it and does it for the sake of His own glory in the world, to confirm and proclaim His will not to be without the world, not to be God in isolation."[27]

But the purpose of God in so humbling Himself also is done for the sake of man - *propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem*. He so acts in the midst of a world which has radical need of Him, in a world which has perverted its being lent to it by God, in a world that is on its way to the abyss. In His Son God takes to Himself the radical neediness of the world, doing for it what it cannot do for itself, arresting and reversing its fatal course to the abyss.[28]

It must be stressed that this is an act which God owes neither to the world nor to Himself. He is in no sense necessitated to act as He does; the only necessity being that of the necessity of the decision which He did in fact make and execute, the necessity of the fact that the being of God has this concrete determination and no other, a necessity in that God posits it and it derives from Him. Only in the fact that God is for us can we answer the question of why He so acts.

With these introductory remarks Barth begins to probe more deeply into this fact that God is pro nobis, to the question of how He is for us, how He has taken up our cause and arrested our course to the abyss, the question of how He has saved man from his sin.

---

[27] *C.D., IV/1*, p. 212.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

In the first place He did this by taking upon Himself to share with man his place and status, his situation, making it His own situation. This phrase, 'man's situation,' is one of the terms that Barth does not define clearly in speaking of reconciliation. He seems to mean two things by it: human creaturliness and human sinfulness. Thus Christ in taking upon Himself the human situation, in the first place fully becomes a creature, He stands with men in their mortal need; He participates in the being of the world. In this act of humiliation in which humanity takes part in the inner life of the Godhead, in the movement of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the reverse also takes place - God participates in the being of the world, playing out His history (Urgeschichte) as world history (Weltgeschichte). And there is no reservation in respect of His solidarity with us. "He did become - and this is the presupposition of all that follows - the brother of man, threatened with man, harassed and assaulted with him, with him in the stream which hurries downward to the abyss, hastening with him to death, to the cessation of being and nothingness."[29]

---

[29] Ibid., p. 215.

But man is sinful man, fallen man, man alienated from God and thus His taking the human situation to Himself means His standing in solidarity with sinful man, His becoming subject to the temptation in which man suffers and in which he becomes a sinner and the enemy of God. He faced the impossible possibility, that which God had not-willed, and yet which assaults man, and He knew its power and strength as no other man. "He was not immune from sin. He did not commit it, but He was not immune from it."[30]

But, Barth asks, what was the purpose of His entering our situation as our brother, why did He so identify Himself with us? The positive answer is that He so acted in order to change the status of man and the world from within, to turn it for good. He came as a redeemer, to reconcile, convert the world to God. But He did so - and this is the controlling concept of this section - as the Judge of the world and every man. "He is the Saviour of the world in so far as in a very definite (and most astonishing) way He is also its Judge."[31] He comes as the One whose concern is for order and peace, who upholds the right and prevents the wrong, for such is the true office of the Judge. It is this designation of Jesus Christ as the Judge which dominates Barth's understanding of the work of Christ.

---

[30] Ibid., p. 216. In Barth's doctrine of election we have more light thrown on this subject. God's primal act ad extra, is to make His own being the being of the other which He wills to have over against Him. This, the content of primal history, is what takes place in world history in the historical Incarnation - the being of the Son takes the place of man and acts for man. In other words, man's situation of alienation from God is met by removing the alien, and putting in his place - that is in the situation of alienation - one who is actually one with God and who now acts for those who are alienated.

Although the office of the Judge is to restore order and peace he does so by judging and this involves pardoning and sentencing. The world and all men are called to account and the question must be raised who can stand when the Son of God calls him to account, especially in the light of the fact that He exercises the judgment of God, the ultimate judgment, the judgment before which every man must bow? For man is the one who sets up his own right against God, who makes himself his own judge, and therefore "because it is a matter of the appearance and work of the true Judge amongst those who think they can and should judge and therefore exalt themselves, therefore the abasement of the Son to our status, the obedience which He rendered in humility as our brother, is the divine accusation against every man and the divine condemnation of every man."[32]

Thus the coming of the Son as Judge means the judgment of rejection and condemnation which is passed on all flesh. Man is lost and condemned to perish, he stands under the divine No, in the darkness in which there is no light. In that man wills what God does not will, by necessity God is against him and he is on the way to eternal perdition.

---

[31] Ibid., p. 217.

[32] Ibid., p. 220.

And yet God is the Lord and how He will fulfill His sentence of judgment is His decision to make: "He can fulfil it - in all its strictness - in such a way that in fulfilling it there is attained that which man in his perversity tried and never could secure for himself - his pardon... He can be so much in earnest against sinful man that He is for him."[33]

Such a judgment is inconceivable on our part; that it takes place can only be told us and in fact is told us in Jesus Christ. He comes to judge the world, but "to show His grace in the execution of His judgment, to pronounce us free in passing sentence, to free us by imprisoning us, to ground our life on our death, to redeem and save us by our destruction. That is how God has actually judged us in Jesus Christ."[34]

This leads Barth to the decisive statement of this section, the answer to the question of how this strange judgment, this saving work took place. "What took place is that the Son of God fulfilled the righteous judgment on us men by Himself taking our place as man and in our place undergoing the judgment under which we had passed."[35] In this way, in this 'for us' He was our Judge against us. "Everything happened to us exactly as it had to happen, but because God willed to execute His judgment on us in His Son it all happened in His person, as His accusation and condemnation and destruction. He judged, and it was the Judge who was judged, who let Himself be judged."[36]

---

[33] *Ibid*., p. 221.

[34] *Ibid*., p. 222.

His humanity allowed Him to be judged like us, but His divinity gave Him the competence and power to allow this to happen to Him and the authority to pronounce us righteous on the ground of what happened to Him.

> In His doing this for us, in His taking to Himself - to fulfil all righteousness - our accusation and condemnation and punishment, in His suffering in our place and for us, there came to pass our reconciliation with God. Cur Deus Homo? In order that God as man might do and accomplish and achieve and complete all this for us wrongdoers, in order that in this way there might be brought about by Him our reconciliation with Him and conversion to Him.[37]

Here we are at the very heart of Barth's teaching on the work of Jesus Christ and face to face with the fact why for him the reconciliation of the world in Him cannot be understood as a mere possibility calling for actualisation in the life of the believer. In Him took place the strange judgment which means the pardon and redemption of man the wrong-doer. "It took place in Him, in the one man, and therefore there and then, _illic et tunc_, and in significance _hic et nunc_, for us in our modern here and now"[38] It cannot disappear or be dissolved in favour of its significance. "Before there is any consideration of its significance, it can and must be taken as that which is significant in its significance, and therefore in and for itself as the history of Jesus Christ as it took place there and then, and as it can be and is recounted: That is how it happened for us."[39]

---

[35] *Ibid*.

[36] *Ibid*.

[37] *Ibid*., p. 223.

It is only because the event of reconciliation has meaning in itself, is a reality in Him, that it also has significance for us. Without this basis of faith there can be no faith. "Jesus Christ for us as a supremely objective happening is the word of reconciliation on the basis of which there is a ministry of reconciliation."[40]

Here Barth turns to the Gospel records to substantiate this understanding of Jesus Christ as the Judge judged in our place and sees the Gospels as divided into two parts - the first in which He as the Judge announces judgment on all, the second in which He as the Judge takes this judgment to Himself. It is in this event, in His history, not the proclamation of it, or the faith in it, or its fulfilment in our lives, that reconciliation takes place: "in and for itself, in and through the existence of the One who acts and suffers in it and therefore objectively for us, this Gospel story is the story of redemption."[41]

---

[38] _Ibid_.

[39] _Ibid_.

[40] _Ibid_., p. 224.

Barth realises that this particular understanding of reconciliation depends on the way one conceives the 'for us' in the formula 'the Judge judged for us', and he directs considerable attention to the development of the meaning of this phrase. For Barth the 'for us' cannot mean simply 'with us'; it cannot have the meaning "that what took place in Jesus Christ stands in relation to us to the extent that it applies to us, that our own existence is intended and envisaged and affected in this happening, in the existence of Jesus Christ."[42] The redemptive happening cannot be conceived as something which embraces both Him and us, including our discipleship, our existence as Christians.

---

[41] Ibid., p. 228.

[42] Ibid.

Rather, the redemptive happening embraces us in His existence which takes us up into itself. He is 'for us' without our being with Him, apart from how we answer the question which is put to us of our fulfilment with or after Him. This is what is fundamental and all important. We are called to fellowship, to discipleship, but our obedience or disobedience to this call does not determine whether it is the event of redemption which took place for us: "It is always in itself the event of redemption which took place for us, whatever may be our answer to that question."[43]

All of this is brought to focus in this one statement of Barth's:

> 'Jesus Christ for us' means that as this one true man Jesus Christ has taken the place of us men, of many, in all the authority and omnipotence and competence of the one true God, in order to act in our name and therefore validly and effectively for us in all matters of reconciliation with God and therefore of our redemption and salvation, representing us without any co-operation on our part.[44]

There is no need whatsoever for completion, only the need to draw consequences and implications from the completed event. The New Testament prepositions: anti, uper and peri so often used in reference to the work of Christ can only be understood as speaking of a place which ought to be ours which has been occupied by another, who acts in this place as only He can. It is valid before even we heard the demand of faith, let alone fulfilled it.[45]

---

[43] Ibid., p. 230.

[44] Ibid.

Barth proceeds to give a detailed explanation of the 'for us', the center of this development being the two points, that Jesus Christ is for us in that He took the place of us sinners, and that He was and is for us in that He suffered and was crucified and died. Here we have the most rigorous rejection of the view that would see in the work of Jesus Christ the possibility of reconciliation which needs man's response in order for it to become actuality.

Jesus Christ took the place of us sinners. In coming as Judge He accepts the responsibility for that which we do in this place which does not belong to us. He exposes Himself to the accusation and sentence which inevitably come upon us in this case. And in that He enters this evil way, we are forced from it, it can no longer be ours.[46]

This can not be stressed enough. Jesus Christ really takes the place of the man of sin; He becomes the one rejected man bearing the sin of the world in order to take this sin radically and totally away. "Our sin is no longer our own. It is His sin, the sin of Jesus Christ. God - He Himself as the obedient Son of the Father - has made it His own. And in that way He has judged it and judged us as those who committed it."[47]

---

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 231.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

Three implications are drawn from the fact that Jesus Christ took the place of us sinners: that the knowledge of sin is revealed only here, for in that He takes our place it is decided what our place is; that it is our sin which He bears, our place which He takes and therefore our sin is forgiven sin in that He represents us and we are no longer burdened by it, but are liberated; and that the ground to do evil has been cut out from under us and thus we have no future in sin, our only possibility being that of repentance, of turning away from the being and activity of sinners.

However, the very center of Barth's thought on the 'for us' is found in his development of the statement that Jesus Christ was and is for us in His crucifixion and death. This is the fulfilment of His humiliation in which He becomes the Judge judged in our place. The passion of Jesus Christ is described as an action, an historical happening, an act of God, the passion of God Himself: "which in its historical singularity not only has a general significance for the men of all times and places, but by which their situation has objectively been decisively changed, whether they are aware of it or not."[48]

---

[47] Ibid., p. 238.

If the passion of Jesus Christ is understood merely in terms of human passion then the crucifixion is nothing more significant than other notable occasions of human suffering. It is only in the light of His Person - that He is the eternal God who in His Son has taken upon Himself this human passion - that He is the Judge who in this passion is actually being judged in the place of all men, that this event is seen in its true meaning. It is a matter of the humiliation and dishonouring of God Himself, the fact that in this death He is supremely God, which leads to the fact that in this death the reconciliation of the world with God is fulfilled. "In this passion there is legally reestablished the covenant between God and man, broken by man but kept by God. On that one day of suffering of that One there took place the comprehensive turning in the history of all creation - with all that this involves."[49]

Here God and this man are confronted with the destruction which threatens all creation, with eternal death, with sin itself, with the determination of man as he has broken his covenant with God. "In the place of all men He has Himself wrestled with that which separates them from Him. He has Himself borne the consequence of this separation to bear it away."[50]

---

[48] *Ibid*., p. 245.

[49] *Ibid*., p. 247.

Thus it is the passion of Jesus Christ Himself that is God's act for us, not something that derives from this act, but the passion itself and as such. It is this which has to be believed and proclaimed as the act of God for us. But once it has been realised that the event itself is the reconciliation of the world with God and not something resulting from it, the attempt still must be made to understand it, and so Barth asks the question what actually took place in this suffering and dying and gives this reply: "In this suffering and dying of God Himself in His Son, there took place the reconciliation with God, the conversion to Him, of the world which is out of harmony with Him, contradicting and opposing Him."[51] This is done without any other, except only for the flesh of Jesus Christ.

The conversion took this form of atonement because of the obstacle of sin. Sin disrupts the covenant and must be removed and overcome both as the obstacle between God and man and as the source which threatens man with death. It is here that Barth goes beyond the traditional notion of what is meant in speaking of Christ being judged in man's place, for this has been seen primarily in terms of the first aspect of sin - the disrupted relation between God and man. Barth affirms this - it is to overcome sin in this dimension that the Son of God as man takes our place, allowing Himself to suffer what we ought to have suffered, to undergo the destruction to which we had fallen victim. However, the decisive thing in His suffering and death is that "in His own Person He has made an end of us as sinners and therefore of sin itself by going to death as the One who took our place as sinners."[52] He thus restores peace between man and God in that He causes sin to be taken and killed on the Cross in His own Person, destroying the source of our destruction, cancelling the relevance of sin to us. A real ontological change has taken place in the human situation.

---

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid., pp. 250,251.

That is to say man no longer has his being as a sinner, as alienated from God. A radical amputation takes place so that to speak of man as sinner is no longer possible. Into the human situation of creaturliness and sinfulness has come one who has the power to act for all, who replaces men in their standing before God. The death which is inevitable to man because of sin is taken by Him and thus ceases to be, it no longer has any ontological standing in relation to man in general.[53]

---

[52] Ibid., p. 253.

This is why Barth continually stresses the passion as a divine action, for only the Son of God can so strive with sin, only He can destroy it. And it is here that he also sees some value in the otherwise doubtful concept of 'satisfaction.' The radical nature of the divine love could only be 'satisfied' in the outworking of its wrath against the man of sin, "only by killing him, extinguishing him, removing him."[54] God has done in the passion of Jesus Christ that which is sufficient to take away sin, to restore peace between He and the creature, to redeem man from death, and as such is the divine action of atonement which has taken place for us.

In the final development of the meaning of the 'for us' Barth stresses the fact that Jesus Christ was and is for us in that He acted justly in what He did. That which could seem so negative - His taking our place as sinners and dying for us - is in reality the great positive act of God, the action of His justice and righteousness. "The suffering and death of Jesus Christ are the No of God in and with which He again takes up and asserts in man's space and time the Yes to man which He has determined and pronounced in eternity."[55] It is because Jesus Christ is this Yes of God spoken in world history and itself become a part of world history that God is in Jesus Christ for us.

---

[53] Once again this thought is closely connected to Barth's doctrine of election. The primal act of God is the rejection of man's rejection and thus reconciliation, election, the decision to have man only as His elect. It is this primal decision which takes place in time in the crucifixion and thus all possibility for man to contradict in time what is true about him in eternity is now once and for all ruled out in that the content of eternity has entered time and acted decisively within it setting it under the eternal determination.

[54] C.D., IV/1, p. 254.

With this final point Barth reaches the conclusion of his exposition on the meaning of Jesus Christ the Judge judged for us. All theology depends upon this *theolgia crucis* as it has been developed as the doctrine of substitution (*Stellvertretung*).

> Everything depends upon the fact that the Lord who became a servant, the Son of God who went into the far country, and came to us, was and did all this for us; that He fulfilled, and fulfilled in this way, the divine judgment laid upon Him. There is no avoiding this strait gate. There is no other way but this narrow way. If the nail of this fourfold 'for us' does not hold, everything else will be left hanging in the void as an anthropological or psychological or sociological myth, and sooner or later it will break and fall to the ground.[56]

---

[55] *Ibid*., p. 255.

[56] *Ibid*., p. 273. At this point Barth acknowledges that the juridical framework he has used is not the only manner in which the New Testament expressed the *pro nobis* aspect of the work of Jesus Christ. In particular there is the cultic view found in Hebrews, John and the letters of Paul. But this framework of thought expresses the same thing that has been elucidated in forensic language. Jesus Christ is the priest who represents all men, taking from

The fundamental intent of Barth's thought on the work of Christ is clear: in His giving of Himself as the Judge judged in our place, reconciliation happens, it is an event, an objective occurrence in itself and as such, it is an ontological reality in which man's existence is once and for all changed, it is actuality. Here is a rigorous alternative to the position of Bultmann - although it would be wrong to view this merely as developed in opposition to Bultmann and not as the culmination of a fundamental motif in Barth's thought present long before this opposition with Bultmann came to the fore - whom Barth interprets as making of reconciliation only a possibility which must be actualised in the all important act of the hearer of the proclamation of the Cross who passes from his old existence to his new, eschatological existence

---

them an office they cannot fill. He gave Himself as a sacrifice to be offered up to take away our sin, and in this sacrifice there takes place the reconciliation of man with God, the old man going up in flames and smoke. Finally, Jesus Christ in our place made a perfect sacrifice, fulfilling the will of God, doing that which is proper and definitive. In Him takes place the conversion of man to God, and all this took place in our stead and for us: "he has sacrificed in our name and with a validity which cannot be limited and a force which cannot be diminished. What He has done He has done in order that being done by Him it may be done by us; not only acceptable to God, but already accepted; our work which is pleasing to Him; our being as those who are dead to sin and can live to righteousness. He alone has done this, but because He has done it, in a decision which cannot be reversed, with a truth which is absolute, He has done it for us." _Ibid_., p. 283.

under God. Such a movement from death to life for Barth is superfluous, for this movement has taken place already in Him. Such phrases as 'in our place,' 'meaning in and of itself,' 'the destruction of sin and the sinner,' in short the whole bold and vigorous interpretation of the 'for us' as meaning a complete substitution, contribute to build a wall of objectivity about this event, which will not allow it to be superseded by that which proceeds from it.

Reconciliation is in Him, accomplished and completed entirely apart from one's subjective response to this event, for in that He took over our responsibility, substituted Himself for us, our history, our lives are included in His as an objective fact. It is important that this objectivity kindles recognition, in fact as we will see, part of its objectivity is that it includes recognition in itself - it is important that consequences be drawn from it, but it is in itself apart from this recognition and the drawing of these consequences the event of reconciliation, the event in which the world is converted to God.

The question as to whether or not such an objective view of the work of Jesus Christ is an adequate representation of New Testament thought on reconciliation will accompany us throughout the rest of this study. Suffice it to say at this point that there is a real question if such an objective viewpoint is the only alternative to the emphasis on subjectivity found in Bultmann, or more specifically whether the interpretation Barth gives to the 'for us' is the only possible interpretation of this phrase. Many interpreters of Barth on this point, though not themselves in agreement with Bultmann's emphases, nevertheless take strong exception with Barth here. A Roman Catholic theologian, Henri Bouillard, interprets the notion of exchange in the New Testament in terms of Christ's solidarity with man, not in terms of permutation, but as meaning 'in our favor,' 'for our advantage.' "C'est bien par l'action de Dieu, mais ce n'est pas sans nous que nous devenons justice de Dieu. La réconciliation ne consiste pas dans un échange de situation, au sens où l'entend Barth, mais dans le fait que le Christ nous associe à sa destinée moyennant notre coopération."[57]

It is obvious that as a loyal Roman Catholic theolgian Bouillard sees the Tridentine teaching on grace as enabling man to cooperate in his salvation as endangered by such strict objectivity, but his protest is also shared by Protestant theologians. G. C. Berkouwer who commends Barth's objectivity in that he sees the realisation of reconciliation as included directly in the reconciling work of Christ, questions the notion of man and his sin as Barth develops it.[58] George Hendry in addition to criticising Barth for the almost mechanistic way he regards the death of Christ, also protests against the way in which Barth makes of the atonement an ontological event in which both objective and subjective elements are inseparable, for in that our responsibility is taken from us and Christ acts in our stead, there is a tendency for us to be dissolved as persons, for the subjective to be swallowed up in the objective.[59]

---

[57] Bouillard, Henri, Karl Barth: Parole de Dieu et Existence Humaine, Aubier, Editions Montaigne, Volume 2, 1957, p. 118.

Rather than linger over these criticisms it is necessary to move on and see how the objectivity of the event of reconciliation works itself out in relation to the anthropological sphere. Barth sees the resurrection as providing the key which allows one to see the positive meaning of christology for anthropology. The whole point of this section is that this turn has taken place in Jesus Christ, that the objective side of the event of reconciliation is the essence of the subjective, that Jesus Christ for us includes the fact that we can proceed and build on Him in our own sphere.

The problem is raised by the fact that in Jesus

---

[58] Berkouwer, G. C., op. cit., p. 317.

[59] Hendry, George, op. cit., p. 127.

Christ our judgment is accomplished, we are dead and crucified as the sinners we are, and thus our existence would have seemed to lose its point, we seem to be removed and done away without any future. The reconciliation of the world in that it consists in this strange judgment would seem to mean the world's dissolution. "In His Person, with Him, judgment, death and end have come to ourselves once and for all."[59]

This problem can be answered affirmatively only in that the positive aspect of the event of reconciliation is disclosed, a disclosure which God alone can postulate, and it is just this disclosure, this beyond that takes place in the awakening, the resurrection from the dead of Jesus Christ.

Barth goes into a long and elaborate description of the resurrection, indicating how it has implications for all men in that it is an act of God; and furthermore how God justifies Himself, Jesus Christ and all sinful men in it in that He acknowledges that the judgment of Jesus Christ in our place was according to His good will and was effective, working for our salvation not our destruction. He also stresses that it takes place in space and time having a factuality about it which is not to be equated with the disciple's faith, but rather stands as the foundation of their faith.

---

[59] C.D., IV/1, p. 296.

Most important in relation to the question of objectivity, however, is the fact that Barth sees the resurrection as the event in which the crucifixion is lifted up into something that takes place once and for all, the event in which it is made an eternal event. "His history (Geschichte) did not become dead history (Historie). It was history in His time to become as such eternal history - the history of God with the men of all time and therefore taking place here and now as it did then."[60] In that He was resurrected and lives eternally the bridge between Him and all men is crossed, the barrier between His life in His time and the life of all men in their time is removed, making the problem of faith and history a wholly subordinate concern.

> In virtue of the divine right established in the death of Jesus Christ, in virtue of the justification which has come to them in His resurrection, they are no longer what they were but they are already what they are to be. They are no longer the enemies of God but His friends, His children. They are no longer turned away from Him, but away from their own being in the past, and turned to Him. They are no longer sinners, but righteous. They are no longer lost, but saved. And all this as He belongs to them and they to Him, He who was in His time to them in their time, and they in their time to Him in His time. All this as He is and does the same for them to-day as He was and did yesterday, the Lord of every time and its content. The resurrection of Jesus Christ affirms that which is actual in His death, the conversion

---

[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 313,314.

> of all men to God which has taken place in Him. For it is the pure and acceptable word which is spoken in every age, that all men are in Him the One, and that He the One is in them, He the One in the midst of them.[61]

What is more, this situation comes to all men whether they hear or accept it or are obedient to it.[62] In Jesus Christ the alteration of the human situation - the situation of all men - took place and continues to take place, namely, the reconciliation of the world with God.

Thus the resurrection is seen as providing the answer to the question of the incompatibility of the existence of Jesus Christ with ours. The death of Jesus Christ has no autonomous significance. "We are not oppressed and extinguished in the death of Jesus Christ, but liberated and refashioned. In virtue of the death of Jesus Christ we are allowed to be. Christology cannot, therefore, be exclusive but inclusive."[63]

Then too, in that the Father pronounced His verdict of approval on the obedience of His Son, the question of the participation of the whole race in the person and work of the one man Jesus Christ, the question of the significance of His being in the anthropological sphere is answered positively. "In so far as this divine verdict has been passed and is in force in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ lives and acts and speaks for all ages and in eternity, and in such a way that we are promised a future and hope, a being before God in reality and truth."[64]

---

[61] Ibid., p. 316, 317.

[62] Ibid., p. 317.

[63] Ibid., p. 350.

Finally the resurrection reveals the certainty of our being established with Jesus Christ. Even as His work derives its value from His deity, the resurrection as a divine act without any human cooperation whatsoever, insures that our life with Jesus Christ "is promised from the place whose sureness and unequivocal transcendence gives to the promise a clarity and certainty which are beyond comparison and compromise."[65] God speaks His Yes here to His Son but also His Yes to the human people whom from all eternity He has also elected and loved in His Son.

This section on the resurrection is one of the most difficult to comprehend in Barth's dogmatics, however, its implications in terms of the objectivity of reconciliation are clear. The strange judgment in which Jesus Christ was judged in our place is in itself the objective reconciliation of the world and the resurrection is the objective event which discloses the objectivity of this reconciliation in its positive meaning, elevating it to the place of an eternal event, to the place of primal history (Urgeschichte), in which the life of every man is encompassed and enclosed. In that Jesus Christ has been judged in our place He also has been raised in our place. The positive meaning of reconciliation disclosed in this event - that the rejected and condemned, the One who must utterly die, is the Elect and Beloved of the Father - includes at the same time our election, a fact which again as with our death and destruction is in force entirely apart from our knowledge of it or response to it.[66]

---

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 354.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 356.

Once he has established the legitimacy of the anthropological sphere Barth turns to see the implications christology has for it. The first subject he discusses is that of sin. Here the objectivity of his thought is quite apparent. Only in the knowledge of reconciliation as disclosed in the resurrection, the knowledge that Christ has stood in our place and been judged as the man of sin, is disclosed to us the knowledge of sin, only here do we see the sinful man who is set aside in His death, the man of pride who sought to be his own Lord; "only when we know Jesus Christ do we really know that man is the man of sin, and what sin is, and what it means for man."[67] In the knowledge of Jesus Christ we are shown as those of whom God made an end, as those who were transferred to the past in Him.

---

[66] For an excellent discussion on Barth's teaching on the resurrection, see R. Richard Niebuhr's book, Resurrection and Historical Reason: A Study of Theological Method, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957.

Thus one can say that for Barth the knowledge of sin always comes in and with the knowledge that sin has been destroyed in Jesus Christ, the knowledge that man needs to be reconciled to God can only come as the shadowy side of the knowledge of his reconciliation. In traditional terminology the Law has no function outside of the Gospel, a man is not driven by the Law to a knowledge of his sin in which condition the word of the Gospel comes to him as the word of deliverance, for such a process would imply that the Gospel needs to be heard, to be believed, that man must subjectively respond to it in order for it to have meaning for him, and this is exactly what Barth will not have. Rather the Gospel is the word that man has passed from his state of disobedience to a state of obedience, from the old man to the new in Jesus Christ entirely apart from his faith or response to this event.

This aspect of Barth's thought is seen especially in the final sub-section of this section: The Fall of Man. The nature of man's corruption can only be answered by viewing the appearance of the man to whom God stooped in Jesus Christ, his situation, the burden which was borne away from him, the status corruptionis set aside by His intervention. In that God's Word is the Word of divine forgiveness, man's corruption is revealed as his debt which he cannot pay; insofar as Jesus Christ died totally for the reconciliation of every man every man's corruption is radical and total; and insofar that in the death of Jesus Christ God willed to have mercy on all men, man's corruption is revealed as universal - all are concluded in disobedience.[68]

---

[67] C.D., IV/1, p. 389.

It is the view of this writer that despite Barth's sincere attempt to take sin seriously by treating it in this way, just the opposite is the case.[69] It will be seen when we discuss Barth's doctrines of creation, sin and especially election, that this difficulty can be traced back to his concept that God in electing necessarily rejects, that His willing includes His non-willing, that even in the event of His own life, He affirms Himself as God and necessarily rejects that which is not God, passing over the possibility of being something other than God.

---

[68] Ibid., p. 501.

[69] Barth defends his treatment of sin within christology as that method which alone takes sin seriously and sees in the Reformer's method of treating sin independently of christology the seeds which led eventually to a weakened understanding of it.

God's act is always the act of double predestination in which that which He elects always has precedence over that which He rejects, but must at the same time be accompanied by the shadow of its rejection. Thus man too is the object of God's double predestination, elected in Jesus Christ but rejected as he is in himself, and this rejection must be reflected in his life as his sin.

This evaluation seems to be substantiated when Barth speaks of mankind as a whole standing under two unities according to the order and will of God, the one embracing them in their future being, the unity of the divine mercy, the other in their past being, the unity of the divine concluding. This latter unity refers to the fact that all men are flesh, that the whole of mankind is united in pride and the fall, the unity described as Adam which is "the truth concerning us as it is known to God and told to us."[70]

But the divine concluding in disobedience, the designating of all men as Adam was only possible in the light of Jesus Christ. Adam, or mankind concluded in disobedience is only the negative side of Jesus Christ who is the first and true Adam.

> It is in relation to the last Adam that this first Adam, the unknown of the Genesis story, has for Paul existence and consistence, and that in what is said of him he hears what is true and necessarily true of himself and all men. It is beyond

---

[70] C.D., IV/1, p. 511.

> the threshold which Jesus Christ has crossed, and every man in Him, that he hears in Him the sentence on himself and all men as a Word of God and not of man - a sentence against which there can be no appeal passed on the man of sin, who was every man, but who no longer exists now that God has had mercy on all with the same universality with which He once concluded all in disobedience.[71]

The objectivity of this viewpoint is quite apparent. All mankind is in Christ, their future is to be part of the divine mercy, and this inclusion in Christ is brought about by Christ Himself in His death and resurrection. From this vantage point man looks at the judgment taken by Christ on Himself and sees himself in Him also as one who has been included under disobedience. The movement from disobedience to mercy is wholly Christ's movement in which man has a part, not a movement which in any way takes place in his life-act, in the decision of faith.[72]

In turning to the doctrine of justification Barth moves from the negative meaning of the judgment of God in the anthropological sphere - our accusation and condemnation as sinners, given up to death in Him - to its positive meaning - that in this judgment we are pardoned and place in a new life before Him and with Him. The problem of justification is to see how peace can be concluded between a holy God and sinful man in a way that is completely and adequately right; the question of the presupposition and the possibility and the truth of the positive relationship of God with man.[73]

---

[71] Ibid., p. 513.

[72] For an elaboration on Barth's understanding of the relation of Christ and Adam, see: Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5, translated by T. A. Snail, Harper's, New York, 1956.

For Barth, the presupposition and possibility of such a positive relation consists (1) in there being a right which is superior to the wrong of man; (2) that this right be worked out in man; and (3) that the wrong of man be set aside and a new human right be established in the working out of this higher right. This higher right is the right of God, its outworking is the setting aside of the wrong of man and the restoring of his right, i.e., the judgment of God; and in the eventuation of this judgment the justification of man takes place.[74]

In the event of justification God is in the right, He affirms His own divine life, maintaining Himself as the God who had elected Himself for man and man for Himself. Before this right man's wrong is absolutely subordinate. God's right encounters man's wrong in judgment, but since His right is the right of His grace, its exercise is in its essence the realisation of His grace so that even in His willing to do away with the wrongdoer, His Yes is buried in His No; for His grace and His righteousness are one.

---

[73] C.D. IV/1, p. 528.

[74] Ibid., pp. 528, 529.

But to man this righteousness of God comes as crisis, his existence is separated at its roots, he as the wrongdoer is condemned and rejected, but at the same time pardoned and maintained by God. He the wrong-doer must die and a new man must be introduced in his place, and this is no mere as if (als ob) but actuality (Realitaten).[75] It must take place as a history in which the man on the left hand is the Whence and the man on the right the Whither of the one man.

These are the presuppositions which must be fulfilled for the event of justification to take place according to Barth. But now one must ask, where does such an event take place? Certainly not in an ideal realm, nor is it the data of our own experience. Yet this event has taken place in a total and definitive way and is in fact our history, more genuine than what we experience today. Our own true history is to take part in the transition from the yesterday that stands under the No of God to the tomorrow which stands under His Yes, and this is all so because it is the today of Jesus Christ. "The day of the judgment of God which overtakes us, of the clash of the righteousness of God with our wrong and therefore with ourselves, the day of which our wrong and death becomes to us the past and our right and life the future - that day is His day. It is as His day that it is our day. His history is as such our history."[76]

---

[75] Ibid., pp. 542, 543.

Here we come upon the fundamental idea that gives us Barth's solution to the problem which we are studying, a solution we have seen before and will see again and again: we are there in the event of reconciliation which takes place in Jesus Christ, our subjectivity is not excluded by looking to Him and Him alone, for the objectivity of His life-act includes our lives.

> It is all true and actual in Him and therefore in us. It cannot, therefore, be known to be valid and effective in us first, but in Him first, and because in Him in us. We are in Him and comprehended in Him, but we are still not He Himself. Therefore it is all true and actual in this Other first and not in us. That is why our justification is not a matter of subjective experience and understanding. That is why we cannot perceive and comprehend it. That is why it is too puzzling to us.[77]

This had to take place in Jesus Christ, for He was elected from all eternity to fulfil God's righteousness and He as very God and very man had competence to do what we were incompetent to do. What in general takes place in Him is the effective self-substitution

---

[76] Ibid., p. 548.

[77] Ibid., p. 549.

(Selbsteinsatz) of God for us sinful men.[78] Matters are taken out of our hands and in Jesus Christ man is set aside as a wrong-doer, He perishes, and thus this is in force for all men; we men as wrong-doers are dead and buried, a thing of the past. But also the life of a new man who is righteous before God is introduced, the eternal Son of the eternal Father, He is the new and righteous One, He receives the good will of the Father, and He receives it for us, for all men, it is also our right. "As He in His act of humility has carried through for all men the end to which we had all fallen victim, so for all men He has actually opened the gate of righteousness and life. His resurrection is the beginning from which we all come when we leave the past which He has concluded, going forward in Him to the future which is already present."[79]

The justification of man in Jesus Christ means that man has been pardoned totally and unconditionally, whether he knows it, accepts it and lives as one pardoned or not. "When this sentence was passed concerning us, something took place which cannot be reversed."[80] Man's situation has been altered, men do have peace with God,

---

[78] Ibid., p. 550.

[79] Ibid., p. 556.

[80] Ibid., p. 570.

God is for us and our corresponding self-knowledge cannot be exposed to any legitimate doubt or genuine problem. But this pardon only takes place as a history, man is placed by the act of God in the history of Jesus Christ, as the man who in every present has both this past and this future.

The fact that man in the present has both his past and future together must be taken seriously and this means that he stands in need of continual forgiveness but at the same time in possession of his future righteousness.

But again Barth insists that this standing as the man of the past and the man of the future is not the experience of the individual Christian; he is not the one who is indicated by such passages as Romans 7 and 8, or Psalms 23. Rather it is only in faith that man sees this to be the reality of his life and life of every man despite outward appearances.

> Faith is itself the absolutely humble but absolutely positive answer to the question of the reality and existence of the man justified by God, to the question who and where this man is. The one who can and does believe knows this man well. He will confess him, and therefore he will confess the judgment and pardon of God, the reality of that history, of that transition of man from his Yesterday to his To-day. In his own person? Yes, but in his own person in its solidarity with all other men, and therefore virtually and prospectively in their persons too. Because he recognises and confesses him in his own person, he also recognises and confesses him in the riddle of the man of every age and clime; he recognises and confesses his infinitely great reality as compared

> with every opposing human picture. He will regard his own being in contrast to his reality, and therefore the riddle of his own person, as not less but much more dubious than all the dubities which he might encounter in past and present history both secular and ecclesiastical. If his faith is the taking away of that which separates himself from the man justified by God, how can it hold back in relation to others, how can it not be virtually and prospectively a faith for others?[81]

Thus to speak of justification by faith means in no way that faith is the one work in distinction from other works which justifies man. Faith rather is the action which is analogous to the existence of the justified man, to the faithfulness of God, in that in it man renounces his pride, abdicates his vain-glory and despairs of saving himself. And it is this negative act because positively it is the adequate response to the self-demonstration of the justified man, i.e., to the crucified and risen Jesus Christ who is the author and recipient and revealer of the justification of all men. He is the One in whom God's judgment is fulfilled and His pardon pronounced on all men. "He is the concrete event of the existence and reality of justified man in whom every man can recognise himself as truly justified."[82]

One can state it this way: faith recognises the reality of justified man as the reality of every man, because Jesus Christ is the reality of every man. "There is not one whose sin is not forgiven sin in Him, whose death is not a death which has been put to death in Him. There is not one whose right has not been established and confirmed validly and once for all in Him. There is not one, therefore, who has first to win and appropriate this right for itself."[83]

---

[81] Ibid., p. 614.

[82] Ibid., p. 630.

This is why faith has this negative form stated above, why it must be viewed as an empty vessel. "If he looks to Jesus Christ, to the event of his own redemptive history as it has taken place in Him, how can he also look to himself and his works?"[84] The *sola fide* is but a faint yet necessary echo of the *solus Christus*. Or another way of putting it is to say in faith a man knows himself and all men to be justified in Jesus Christ apart from his faith.[85]

After discussing other aspects of the act of faith not specifically relevant to our study, Barth concludes this section by giving his approval to the Reformer's understanding of this doctrine, quoting without comment from questions 60, 61 and 64 of the Heidelberg Catechism. The real question that faces one here is whether Barth in this exposition does not change the meaning of this doctrine considerably from the way it was expounded by the Reformers. For Luther and Calvin - and here they seem to be faithful interpreters of Paul - faith is the correlate to the person and work of Christ which makes His reconciling work a reality to the Christian. The very Heidelberg Catechism from which Barth quotes speaks of man's righteousness before God as based on the unmerited mercy of God who accounts Christ's righteousness as that of the Christian, '"if only I receive this benefit with a believing heart."'[86]

---

[83] *Ibid*.

[85] Bouillard, *op. cit*., v. 2, p. 75: "La thèse de la justification par la foi seule, telleque Barth l'expose, revient paradoxalement à celle-ci: l'homme est justifié par le Christ, *sans* la foi."

[84] *Ibid*., p. 632.

Again we are confronted with Barth's extreme objectivity, an objectivity which is so severe, that even the experiences of Christian individuals are interpreted only as referring to their knowledge of their participation in the objective event of reconciliation, as the description of the movement of the life of Jesus Christ which they know as the reality that encompasses their lives. This problem is the same problem that has emerged to the foreground already as we have considered Barth's thought and it presents us with one of the basic difficulties of his work which will continue with us throughout this exposition.

---

[86] C.D. IV/1, p. 642.

Up to this point in his treatment of reconciliation Barth has been speaking of its objective side, of that which is disclosed concerning man, the fact of his sin and the fact of his justification, entirely apart from his knowledge of it. But reconciliation has a subjective side as well, it involves the active participation of man, and to this Barth turns in the final two sections under the title: The Holy Spirit and the Gathering of the Christian Community and The Holy Spirit and Christian Faith.

It is the work of the Holy Spirit which is central in the question of subjective response, for He awakens man and brings him into participation in the event of reconciliation. He "is God intervening and acting for man, addressing Himself to him in such a way that He says Yes to Himself and this makes possible and necessary man's human Yes to Him."[87]

The Holy Spirit evokes this yes from man by attesting to him the Son, His way of obedience, His substitution for us, His justification, and in fact the Holy Spirit is the form in which the action of Jesus Christ continues. "He is the power of Jesus Christ in which it takes place that these are His, that their history is genuinely enclosed in Him and His history is equally genuinely enclosed in theirs."[88] The work of the Holy Spirit, to use terms Barth employs elsewhere, is to awaken men _de facto_ to their _de iure_ reconciliation in Jesus Christ.

---

[87] Ibid., p. 646.

Thus in terms of the problem we are discussing the community and the individual Christian within the community are not distinguished from the world in that reconciliation is a reality here, whereas it is only a possibility unrealised there, but as those in whom the noetic recognition of reconciliation, of their being in Christ takes place, a recognition of that which is the ontic reality of the whole world.

As we have seen the history or life of Jesus Christ is the history and life of all men, despite their contradiction of it. Every man belongs to Jesus Christ, He is the reality of every man, the whole world is converted to Him; and it is as a witness to this togetherness of Jesus Christ and every man that the Christian community exists. For the community lives as the provisional representation of the conversion of the world, it is the earthly-historical form of His existence, His body; it acknowledges and confesses before all others what has been done for all in Jesus Christ, and what, as it has been done for all, will be seen and acknowledged and confessed by all when He appears.[89]

---

[88] _Ibid_., p. 648.

So too, when Barth speaks of the faith of the individual, it is in terms of the acceptance of the relationship which is there for the believer and unbeliever alike apart from the act of faith.

> What takes place in faith is simply that in a specific activity, which in this sense it to some extent expects, this objective *res* finds existence and essence and dignity and significance and scope, creating respect for itself and actually being respected in the presence of this activity - but only as it was already the object of this subject, only as it had all these things, existence, essence, dignity, significance and scope even for this subject, and without his activity and faith and respect.[90]

This idea is further developed when Barth speaks of faith as an ontological necessity. In that in the death of Jesus Christ both destroying and renewing have taken place for all men and in that this has been revealed as valid for all men in the resurrection, faith is for man ontologically necessary. Jesus Christ is not an alternative placed before him, but the only reality in which he can live and thus negatively, unbelief is a real and ontological impossibility. When man is awakened by the Holy Spirit he awakens to the only objective, real and ontological thing he can do, choosing that for which he is already chosen by the divine decision and besides which he has no other choice.[91]

---

[89] *Ibid*., p. 662.

[90] *Ibid*., p. 742.

This act has a cognitive character, consisting in acknowledgment, (Anerkennen) recognition (Erkennen) and confession (Bekennen). "It does not alter anything, as a human act it is simply the confirmation of a change which has taken place."[92] Yet Barth realises that faith in the New Testament is also described as having a creative character, which he attributes to the fact that part of the altered human situation which takes place objectively in Jesus Christ and which the community and the Christian can only confirm, is that this altered situation have this confirmation, that there be individual Christian subjects, and in this sense, in that they attest by their confirmation that the reconciliation has confirmation, they give witness to the objective scope of reconciliation, to the fact that that which is actuality in Jesus Christ includes in itself the recognition of this actuality. In this their faith is more than cognition, but also creative.

Here we are confronted with the first attempt of Barth to stress the importance of subjectivity in relation to his rigorous development of its objectivity. The type of objectivity which he has developed can only lead to describing subjectivity in noetic terms, a subjectivity that is similar to knowledge of the laws of nature, of that which is valid and in effect regardless of such knowledge and thus regardless of subjectivity. Yet he realises such a conception of Christian subjectivity is inadequate, so he makes of the noetic experience part of the ontic event itself, and thus the knowing of the Christian, which is in essence what separates him from the non-Christian, also separates him ontically from the non-Christian. It actually constitutes for him a difference in being.

---

[91] Ibid., p. 748.

[92] Ibid., p. 751.

Such an attempt at the least seems forced. But before criticising this concept further, we must look at the objective basis Barth gives to this thought, in his understanding of the significance of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

Chapter III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF BARTH'S THOUGHT IN VOLUME IV/2: JESUS CHRIST, THE SERVANT AS LORD

In the second volume of his doctrine of reconciliation, given the general title - Jesus Christ, the Servant as Lord - Barth turns to a more specific study of the man reconciled to God in this event. The concern of the first volume was to see the mighty condescension of God, the obedience of the Son, in the event of reconciliation, and it was seen that included in this act of condescension was the recognition of and the attesting to this act on the part of man. Barth now seeks to develop the objective basis of man's participation in this event of reconciliation, for this is as much a part of this event as the divine condescension that calls it forth. The whole movement of reconciliation is summarised in the Old Testament phrase 'I will be your God and you shall be my people;' it is to this 'you shall be my people' aspect of the one event of reconciliation that we are now directed.

Barth's thought on this problem can best be seen in a quotation from the opening pages of this volume:

> Now what was done to man, and the meaning for him of the divine work of atonement and therefore of the grace of God, is that, as God condescends and humbles Himself to man and becomes man, man himself is exalted, not as God or like God, but to God, being placed at His side, not

> in identity, but in true fellowship with Him, and becoming a new man in this exaltation and fellowship. It is true enough that the event of atonement is wholly and utterly a movement from above to below, of God to man. But it is also true that this truth encloses the further truth that the atonement is wholly and utterly a movement from below to above, the movement of reconciled man to God.[1]

As we have seen in our brief introductory remarks on the structure of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation, in and with and at the same time as there takes place the humiliation of God, there also takes place the exaltation, the raising up of the Son of Man, which gives Barth the title for the christological section of this volume: The Exaltation of the Son of Man.

In other words, the covenant has been fulfilled from both its sides in Jesus Christ. In Him, the covenant-making God and the covenant-keeping man are one. He is the man exalted by the grace of God, the new humanity well pleasing to God. The important issue for the problem with which we are dealing here is the extreme objectivity with which Barth develops this thought. Even as in the humiliation of the Son of God who was judged in our place, our sinful being was removed from us in actuality apart from any human response, so in the exaltation of the Son of Man, which is part of the same act of reconciliation, takes place also our exaltation to fellowship with God as an actuality apart from out response to it, and on the basis of this effective exaltation of man, implications are drawn for the sphere in which man lives his life.

---

[1] C.D., IV/2, p. 6.

> In and with His humiliation (as the Son of God) there took place also His exaltation (as the Son of Man). This exaltation is the type and dynamic basis for what will take place and is to be known as the exaltation of man in his reconciliation with God. In His fellowship with God, and therefore in our fellowship with Him, this One, there is achieved our fellowship with God, the movement of man from below to above, from himself to God. It is primarily and properly this human Subject, who, as the object of the free and liberating grace of God, cannot be only an object in the event of atonement, but also becomes an active Subject. In Him man is made the new man, reconciled with God.[2]

Barth develops this theme in the subsection entitled: The Homecoming of the Son of Man. Our concern is not so much with the lengthy development of the Person of Jesus Christ as the true man which is the primary content of this section, but with the implications this has for our particular problem.

In speaking of the *vere homo* of Jesus Christ Barth returns to a theme developed earlier in volume III, 2, namely that to refer to Him as true man does not mean that He partakes of a human nature whose characteristics we know, but that He Himself defines human nature, that a genuine knowledge of man can be based only on a particular knowledge of Him.

---

[2] *Ibid*., p. 19.

As *the* true man, however, He differs from us, in that because His existence is also that of the Son of God, there took place in His history an exaltation of the humanity which is common to Him and all men.[3] "In His person, as the *humanitas* of this man, *humanitas* itself is in motion - from here to there, from the far country to which the Subject who acts here as man, the Son of God, gave Himself, back again to the home which is shown to be the home of man by the fact that the One who came from it willed to become and be the Son of Man, and to which every man may really return, and has already done so, in the person of this One."[4] He completely contradicts the course of man's life, affirming the grace of God, being the man well pleasing to God and thus exalting our essence into a completely different sphere.[5]

Barth discusses this exaltation of the Son of Man in its three theological contexts of election, incarnation and resurrection and ascension. The question of election will be one which concerns us in detail in a later section. Suffice it to say here that Barth sees the humanity of Jesus Christ as the primary content of God's eternal election of grace, as the divine decision preceded by none higher apart from the event of God's own trinitarian life.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

> As a history which took place in time, the true humanity of Jesus Christ is, therefore, the execution and revelation, not merely of *a* but of *the* purpose of the will of God, which is not limited or determined by any other, and therefore by any other happening in the creaturely sphere, but is itself the sum of all divine purposes, and therefore that which limits and determines all other occurrence.[6]

Because the humanity of the Son is the point from which all things derive in the temporal execution of the will of God, because His humanity in its own way has a basic reality in the council of God which is the basis of all reality, all that takes place in His life in terms of His exaltation is as much a reality as what happens in His humiliation. Thus, the notion that what happens in His humanity is extended to man's life only as a possibility, is completely denied.

> If He exists as the object of the eternal election of grace at the beginning of all God's ways and works, this means that He, the true Man, is *the* One, whose existence necessarily touches that of all other men, as the decision which is made concerning them, as that which determines them inwardly and from the standpoint of their being as men, in whom and for whom they too are elect. Being made man among them, He comes to His own possession (Jn. 1:11). Whether they recognise it or not, He is their Head from all eternity. He can be more to them than an example. He can do that which He does actually do in the atonement, representing God

---

[6] *Ibid*., p. 31.

> to them and them to God. His history can be their own history of salvation. In this one man God can reconcile the world to Himself. And this is not only something which can happen. It is something which does happen. As the true man, the One who was the Head before the foundation of the world, He shows Himself in this happening to be the presupposition and condition of the being of all men, whose claim on their existence and promise for them are valid from the very first - even before they accept them and take up a position in relation to them - and are therefore strictly valid. It is in this strict validity that they also become temporal history. It is in this strict validity that they will to be recognised and acknowledged.[7]

In reference to the historical fulfilment of the concept of true man, to the Incarnation itself, Barth's emphasis is on the sovereignty and initiative of God in this act. In that it is the nature of the true God to be humble, in His mode of being as the Son, He wills and becomes the human partner of the covenant as well as its Lord, He keeps it from man's side as well as God's. He, God the Son, became and is also man.

In the act in which the Son of God takes humanity into union with Himself Barth uses the traditional concepts of _an_ and _en hypostasia_ - i.e., there is no actuality of the humanity of Jesus Christ in itself, but it has its actuality in union with the Son of God - as being unavoidable if one is to describe the mystery aright. Moreover, that which the Son assumed into unity with Himself was not merely 'a man,' "but the humanum, the being and essence, the nature and kind, which is that of all men and which characterises them all as men, and distinguishes them from other creatures."[8] Thus His existence has a relevance for all men, for it is not merely one man, but the humanum of all men which is posited and exalted as such to unity with God.[9]

---

[7] _Ibid_., p. 36.

The unity between the Son of God and the Son of Man is stressed by Barth in the strongest terms. The existence of the Son of God became and is the existence of a man; He became the human Thou which as such is also directly the Thou of the one eternal God.[10] God Himself speaks, acts and suffers when this man speaks, acts and suffers. This is why His history has the significance it does for us, for God is the acting Subject here. This as we have seen throughout is a continual stress. It is the deity of Jesus Christ that gives Him His significance, that allows Him to do His saving work and do it completely and perfectly.

> The human speaking and acting and suffering and triumphing of this one man directly concerns us all, and His history is our history of salvation which changes the whole human situation, just because God Himself is its human subject in His Son, just because God

---

[8] Ibid., p. 48.

[9] Ibid., p. 49.

[10] Ibid., p. 50.

> Himself has assumed and made His own our human nature and kind in His Son, just because God Himself came into this world in His Son, and as one of us 'a guest this world of ours He trod.'[11]

Barth stresses with equal vigor that there are two natures involved in this union. The Son of God really participates in human essence, He unites in His Person that which by definition cannot be united, and in this union neither side is destroyed. Both the humiliation of the divine and the exaltation of the human retain their designations as divine and human in this union, not changing into one another.

With this Barth moves to his central concern in this section, namely that in the union the Son of God exalted human essence into Himself and as very God became very man.[12] In Jesus Christ our human essence is conjoined with the divine essence. Barth is quick to point out that this does not mean that the two elements in this history are in simple correspondence. His humiliation as the Son of God is that He becomes man, but His exaltation as the Son of Man is not that He has become God.

> The human essence of the Son of God will always be human essence, although united with His divine essence, and therefore exalted in and by Him, set at the side of the Father, brought into perfect fellowship with Him, filled and directed by the Holy Spirit, and in full harmony

---

[11] _Ibid_., p. 51.

[12] _Ibid_., p. 69.

> with the divine essence common to Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It will be the humanity of God. But it will still be humanity and not deity - human and not divine essence.[13]

Barth defines this mutual participation of the divine and human in Jesus Christ in terms of what is imparted to the human by the divine and to the divine by the human; of what is addressed to the human essence in this impartation; and of the common actualisation of divine and human essence as it takes place on the basis of this impartation.

The emphasis made in this fuller explanation is that all that is proper to God and all that characterises human essence is proper to Jesus Christ, that His life takes place as God and man in the fellowship of this history; that this means that all that God is He is not for Himself, but in His freedom for the sake of man, for him. Human essence is addressed by the totality of divine essence, He participates in human essence and wholly determines it, making it "an essence which exists in and with God and is adopted and controlled and sanctified and ruled by Him."[14] Humanity is completely ruled by the grace of God and as such is exalted to its freedom, "to the obedience in whose exercise it is not superhuman, but true human freedom."[15] Human essence is further made the participant in the presence and effective working of the Holy Spirit for the Son of God who with the Father is the source of the Spirit and also lives in the unity of the Spirit, is also the Son of Man.

---

[13] Ibid., p. 72.

[14] Ibid., p. 88.

In this confrontation of human essence with the divine, human essence is allowed to serve the divine, it is given the power to execute its act and acts effectively, to participate in the mediatorial action of the Son, being the bearer and server of the divine power and authority. And finally, in that human essence is addressed by the divine "it is given a glory and exalted to a dignity and clothed with a majesty which the Son who assumed it and existed in it has in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost - the glory and dignity and majesty of the divine nature."[16] Human essence is adopted into fellowship with God's being, God has human flesh for His clothing and temple and organ. "God is God in His connexion with the human essence of Jesus Christ (and therefore our own) as it has taken place in Him and is indissoluble in His existence. And it is only in this divinely established connexion with human essence that we can know God, and magnify Him, and love Him and call upon His name."[17]

---

[15] Ibid., p. 92.

[16] Ibid., p. 100.

[17] Ibid., p. 101.

This must always be seen as God's act; exalted man is the spoil of the divine mercy. Man is no longer far from Him, but near to Him, "a man who even as such and precisely as such is a man as we are, the first-born of a new humanity; the second Adam who is still our elder Brother and in whose exaltation our own has already taken place."[18]

This brings us to Barth's understanding of the common actualisation of the divine and human essence as it takes place in Jesus Christ - all that which he has been speaking of in the foregoing development - and it is here where we see the importance of all this material for our problem. Barth sees his treatment as an actualising of the traditional concepts which speak of the Incarnation; as an attempt to see the life of Jesus Christ in historical terms, as an operatio between God and man. It is precisely this act of God, in which the Son of God becomes identical with the man Jesus of Nazareth, uniting human essence with divine essence and therefore exalting human essence into fellowship with God that is the event of reconciliation itself.

> The Subject Jesus Christ is this history. This is the content of the eternal will and decree of God. As it takes place, there takes place the reconciliation of the world with God. It is the divinely spoken Word of truth and life and judgment

---

[18] Ibid., p. 103.

> and comfort and commandment and hope. It is the justification of man, his sanctification, and his calling to the kingdom of God. It is the being of the Church in the world.[19]

This history is the act of God which belongs to a definite time and yet takes place today, is present in all times, and as such has relevance for every age in itself.[20]

The objectivity of this viewpoint is quite obvious. Even as reconciliation in its aspect as the putting to death of the old man, the destruction of sin, takes place perfectly and is in effect for all men in Jesus Christ, so reconciliation in its positive side, in the raising up of the new man to fellowship with God, the man who is the recipient of God's grace and in freedom attests God, man as the keeper of the covenant, is perfectly completed in Jesus Christ and is the reality in effect for all men. This history, the event of His life, His person, which is His work, is where reconciliation happens and it happens in a way that includes the life of all men.

> This exaltation comes to human essence in the person of Jesus of Nazareth who is the Son of God. It does so once, but once and for all, in this One. It does so in Him in a way which is valid and effective for all who are also of human essence, for all His brothers. It is to be seen only in this One. But in Him it is revealed as the divine decision which has been made and is

---

[19] _Ibid._, p. 107.

[20] _Ibid._

> declared concerning all men. In respect of all other men human essence can only be called an essence which in its creaturliness is sharply distinct from that of God, and in its perversion alien and opposed and hostile. But this is not the case in respect of this One. In Him, it is certainly distinct from God as concerns its creaturliness. But it is also bound to Him. And its godlessness and opposition and hostility are not only denied but removed and replaced by His perfect fellowship with God. In Him the homecoming of the Son of Man has already taken place. The true man - and we have purposely used the term in a rather stronger sense than in the older theology - is already present. In spite of all that we are, and must be called, without Him, the divine promise that we shall be like Him has already been pronounced. In Him, in His being as man, the reconciliation of the world with God has already taken place, the Kingdom of God has already come on earth, the new day has already dawned.[21]

Finally, Barth turns to the question of how this event becomes knowledge to man, how it comes about that Jesus Christ is known as this One, that His homecoming has the character of revelation. The objective basis of this subjective dimension of reconciliation is the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ. In these events He bears witness to Himself, His glory is proclaimed. It is only on the basis of Easter that Pentecost can take place. In the resurrection and ascension the divine No and Yes spoken on Golgotha are revealed, and the Holy Spirit uses this objective basis as the source from which all subjective knowledge of Jesus Christ can derive. In His resurrection and ascension, God's will is no longer hidden or only actualised objectively on earth, but as actualised truth, it is declared to the world. It is this which makes this knowledge unconditional and completely trustworthy.

---

[21] *Ibid*., p. 117.

The third subsection in the christological development - The Royal Man - is an attempt to develop the picture of Jesus Christ as the true man in relation to the Gospel accounts of His life. The New Testament pictures Jesus' life in its distinctiveness and in its agreement with the existence of God, with the fact that He lived kata theos, existing analogously to the mode of God's existence, corresponding to the plan and purpose and work and attitude of God in the creaturely sphere. He then turns to the act of His life in which the distinctiveness of His existence, His likeness to God is actual. In this section he enters upon a long discussion of miracles which he sees primarily as the concrete acts which revealed the incursion of a new thing, the coming of the Kingdom of God which is identical with the life of Jesus Christ. Of specific interest to the theme of this paper is a long discussion on the relation of miracles to faith and in particular an explanation of those passages in which faith is spoken of as having saving efficacy.

According to Barth one must remember when the New Testament speaks of faith it does not only describe the believing thought and knowledge and confession and activity of man but embraces the presupposition of all these things which belong not to the mental sphere, but to that of reality - the ontological standing of man in relationship with Jesus Christ. Those who believe do so because they are 'in Christ.' "The act or work of their faith derives from their being, just as a shoot does from a root. Who can say where the root ends and the shoot begins?"[22] In faith a man reaches back to that which is before him and revealed in Him, and they are sustained by this ontological reality both behind and before their faith.

It is only on this presupposition that faith is spoken of in the New Testament as saving one:

> In the New Testament sense of the word the human action of faith can only represent the transition from this origin to this goal, from the free election of man to his free calling, or, to reduce it to its simplest and most concrete terms, from Jesus to Jesus: and if we then recognise that as this transition it has a real part in the being and power of this origin and goal, in Jesus Himself, from whom and to whom we can believe.[23]

In other words, the act of faith presupposes a man's being in Christ. Part of this being in Christ consists of man's knowledge of this, of his recognition that he is both from God and to God, and faith is the action in which this transition takes place. Again the highly noetic definition of faith on the part of Barth is apparent.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 241.

[23] Ibid., pp. 241, 242.

The fourth and final subsection entitled: The Direction of the Son, is parallel to the transitional section of volume IV, 1, in which the question of the power of the one man Jesus Christ for mankind in its anthropological sphere which He made His own when He became man, is discussed - the question of how and what He was and is and will be, can and must and will reach and affect us.

Such a discussion is carried on within the presupposition that the power and lordship of the Son of man does reach us and affects all men "not merely as an offer and possibility, but as a reality, an event, which in its scope is actually determinative of all human existence."[24] He, the Royal Man, lives as our Brother; He does not have to become this and what this means for all men can not be altered or amended or completed. "We may just as easily question the ground on which we walk or the air which we breathe as the perfection of the decision that has been taken concerning us in Him."[25] The problem is to see the meaning, the extent, the depth of the change wrought by

---

[24] Ibid., p. 267.

[25] Ibid.

Him in its meaning for our existence, to know the freedom in which His lordship as the Son of Man sets us.

With this introduction Barth asks the question, what really took place in the homecoming of the Son of Man, His exaltation to fellowship with God, to participation in His lordship over all things? Was this just the isolated history of this one man? Yes, this is true, the reconciliation of man with God happened in His history, and not that of any other man. However, the singularity of this one man's history encompasses the life of every man.

> But for all its singularity as His history it was not and is not a private history, but a representative and therefore a public. His history in the place of all other men and in accomplishment of their atonement; the history of their Head, in which they all participate. Therefore, in the most concrete sense of the term, the history of this One is world history. When God was in Christ He reconciled the world to Himself (2 Cor. 5:19), and therefore us, each one of us. In this One humanity itself, our human essence, was and is elevated and exalted.[26]

In perfect likeness with us as our Brother, He was unlike us as the true and royal man and thus to human essence in all its nature and corruption "there now belongs the fact that in the one Jesus Christ, who as the true Son of God was and is also the true Son of Man, it has now become and is participant in this elevation and exaltation."[27]

---

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

[27] Ibid., p. 270.

Human life can only take place in this brotherhood; all self-knowledge can only begin at this point.

This fact - the Christmas message - is not dependent on our acceptance of it, nor on its repetition in our lives. Before we were in any position to accept or reject it, we were taken up into the fellowship with God for which we were ordained, but which we ourselves had broken.[28] The case of all men is advocated and conducted by this One, all participate in Him, all are exalted with Him to true humanity. This is a reality only in Him, "but there can be no question of our not being in Him as the elected, called, instituted and revealed Lord and Head of all men, of our not being in His representative existence, as if our own obedience were not anticipated and virtually accomplished in His."[29]

In ourselves we are below, but in Christ we are above, we are Christians, and the Christmas message is that we do not live in a dialectic of being below and being above, but is rather "the decision that we are not apart from Christ but in Him; that we are not without Him but with Him; that if we are to see ourselves we must not look at ourselves but look at Him."[30] We do have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ - this is a fact - we are claimed as those who are regenerate and converted, as those already engaged in that turning to God.

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid., p. 272.

Thus there is an ontological relationship between Jesus Christ and every man. Jesus Christ is the Lord of every man - all, Christian and non Christian belong to Him and can be claimed as His _de iure_.[31] This ontological connection between Jesus Christ and all men - which we have already mentioned in the discussion on miracles - is the legal basis of the kerygma and this is why the community must have a missionary character, for it knows that its legal basis of faith stands also for all other men. This is why the kerygma does not deal with possibilities but declares actualities.[32] Thus the confession 'Jesus lives' includes with it the statement 'and I with Him.' "What the community recognises in faith in the being of Jesus Christ its Lord is the divine decision which in this One as the Lord of all men has been taken for all men and concerning the being of all men. It is, therefore, their participation in His exaltation."[33] There is no Jesus Christ who is what He is exclusively for Himself and no sinful man who is not together with the man Jesus, who is not elevated with Him as a true covenant-partner of God.[34] The totus Christus includes both.

---

[31] _Ibid_., p. 275.

[32] _Ibid_.

[33] _Ibid_., p. 280.

As we have seen Barth stresses the importance of seeing the ontological nature of these statements which speak of Jesus as being together with all men. This is a statement of faith, but as such it is also a statement of the knowledge of being and the power of being, not a mere value judgment. We really are with Him, and only because of this objective being, can the statements of subjective assurance be made.

Thus again the objectivity of Barth's thought on reconciliation is developed in the most rigorous terms. In the history of Jesus Christ as the humiliated Son of God and the exalted Son of Man our history is also included. The man of sin which we all are is put to death in Him - this is an ontological change in our situation and thus to live as the man of sin is no longer a possibility for us - and the new man, the man exalted to fellowship with God is alive - this too being an ontological fact in which we partake, being the only direction open for us. This is now our being, our situation, the atmosphere in which we live; this is the basis of faith, for in faith a man awakens to the fact of that which is there and in force before his faith and apart from his faith, for only in this can his faith take certainty. The being of Jesus Christ includes all men; He is not Jesus Christ without His community and all men, anymore than the Son of God is the Son of God without also being the Son of Man. In fact, the _an_ and _en hypostasia_ which Barth applies to the relation of deity and humanity in Jesus Christ can very well be applied to the relation of Jesus Christ and all men.[35] No man has his being in and of himself, but is only himself as he is in Jesus Christ. Such a concept rests on Barth's doctrine of election which we have seen as coming increasingly to the foreground in this whole study. When we turn to consider this doctrine we will see in a more highly developed way this notion of the all-inclusive character of the being of Jesus Christ.

---

[34] Ibid., p. 281.

The unity between Jesus Christ and all men is further stressed in Barth's discussion of how man's being in Christ breaks forth from the concealment in which it is hidden, i.e. the Cross, into our own lives. Jesus Christ Himself is the One who breaks through this concealment. The objective reality, namely our being in Him, demands a subjective pressing in upon us as our seeing and understanding and knowing so that our existence is determined by it and we are awakened and summoned to love in return the One who has first loved us.[36] We are seized by the truth, claimed by it; because we belong to Jesus Christ we are therefore ordained to hear the news concerning Him.

---

[35] Barth hints at this in _Ibid_., p. 59.

This is the miracle of Christian subjectivity, in which the power of Jesus Christ's resurrection demonstrates itself to a man and in so doing makes the transition from what is true and actual in Him to what is true for us. Man is snatched upward, his total life is affected, for he now lives in fellowship with God, defying the discontinuity from which his life suffers. He now participates in eternal life, in his election in Him, while he is in the shadow of death. It is the power coming from His resurrection in which there is made known to man the humiliation of the Son of God for us and the exaltation of the Son of man for us as it has taken place in Jesus Christ and therefore the deliverance and establishment of our own being, so that our existence receives a new determination.[37]

This power is the outgoing and receiving and preserving of the Holy Spirit. He it is who brings about this miracle of subjectivity, who awakens man to His being in Christ, making his being in Christ a fact which determines his life. In his exposition of the work of the Holy Spirit we come upon one of Barth's most daring concepts, for the Holy Spirit in uniting Christ and the Christian, in overcoming the distance between them, repeats and represents and expresses what God is in Himself.[38] The Holy Spirit is the fellowship, the unity, the peace, the love that there is in God, the unity of the Father and the Son. "It is with the unity of God, and therefore with God Himself that we have to do when we have to do with the Holy Spirit in the event of the transition, the communication, the mediation between Jesus and us."[39] Thus the problem of distance and confrontation, of encounter and partnership is primarily the problem of God's own being which He answers by the Holy Spirit and which He also answers in uniting us to Christ - this latter problem being a reflection of the divine problem.

---

[36] Ibid., p. 302.

[37] Ibid., p. 318.

The antitheses in which we stand are merely shadows of divine antitheses eternally fruitful in the Holy Spirit. God's life is history in partnership - the Father with the Son and the Son with the Father in the Holy Spirit - and it is this history in partnership which is reflected in His whole action and will ad extra:

---

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 341.

[39] *Ibid.*

> What then, on the one side, is the distance, the confrontation, the encounter and the partnership between Himself and the world, Himself and man, but a representation, reflection and correspondence of the distinction with which He is in Himself the Father and the Son? And what, on the other side, is the transition, the mediation, the communication and the history which He causes to take place in the covenant with man, in man's election, in the incarnation of the Son, but also in the rule of His fatherly providence over the existence of all His creatures, and in the execution of the reconciliation of the world with Himself, but again the representation, reflection and correspondence of the union of the Father and Son in the Holy Spirit as His own eternal living act?[40]

In our realisation of this fact - that we live in this history of partnership with God's Son and that in so doing genuinely participate in Himself, in His triune life and in the problem of this life and its solution - we can have confidence and take comfort.

The thought of Barth at this particular point is most complex and difficult to grasp. What he appears to be saying is this: God's life is that of an inter-personal Being, in which Father and Son though distinct from One another, though One commands and the Other obeys, though One is Superior and the Other Subordinate, nevertheless, in this diversity, are One, in that together they are the source of the Holy Spirit, the peace, the unity, the fellowship between them. In God's movement ad extra He repeats the history of His eternal being. The Son elects humanity for Himself, an act analogous to the inner-Trinitarian act between Father and Son in that Barth speaks of this relationship as also being one of grace. Thus the humanity of Jesus Christ exists in relation to His deity in a way analogous to the relation of the Son to the Father - subordinate and obedient to it, attesting it by this obedience. But again Jesus Christ is One, even as the Father and Son are One because He possesses the Holy Spirit which overcomes the antithesis between deity and humanity. Finally man himself exists in a way analogous to that of the humanity of Jesus Christ, in that he has his being in that he is subordinate and obedient to the divine-human reality, Jesus Christ, and once again the antithesis between Jesus Christ and man is overcome in the Holy Spirit who unites them as One while at the same time maintaining their distinctness.

---

[40] Ibid., p. 346.

If this is what Barth intends, and from a study of this section, this writer can draw no other conclusion,[41] then Arnold Come's observation that for Barth man is merely a mode of one of the modes (Sonship) of God's being,[42] and the charge of Panentheism which has been levelled at Barth have validity to them.[43] It also explains Barth's statements concerning faith as man's only possibility, and his whole complicated doctrine of freedom which is in essence, the freedom to be obedient to the determination one is given. However, its adequacy both in understanding man as creature and giving a real meaning to life as it takes place on this historical plane of decision and action, is doubtful. We will return to this question more fully in the concluding section.

---

[41] See here especially Ibid., pp. 350-352.

[42] Come, Arnold, op. cit., p. 85. Or perhaps as Come suggests and as is more in keeping with the analysis made above, a mode of a mode (Jesus Christ) of a mode (Sonship) of the being of God.

We will briefly consider now the way that Barth's thought works itself out in the anthropological sphere in terms of our problem. His treatment of man's sin under the general title: The Sloth and Misery of Man is quite similar to the section of man's pride in volume IV, 1. Whereas the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ the humiliated Son of God reveals the man of pride as he who is set aside in this judgment, the direction of God given in the resurrection of Jesus Christ the royal man discloses who is overcome in His death, i.e., the man who would not make use of his freedom, but is subject to his own stupidity, inhumanity, dissipation and anxiety and delivered up to his own death.[44]

---

[43] Bouillard, Henri, _op. cit_., v. 3., p. 24.

[44] _C.D., IV/2_, p. 378.

Man's sin is seen as being his contradiction to his truth, his determination in Jesus Christ. Men are now estranged from the place where they would be if He had not existed, they are now above with Him in fellowship with God, but to this above actualised in Him there corresponds a very definite below, a separation from God.[45] Thus in our confrontation with Him where we meet true human essence we are shamed for this human essence meets us in a form in which it completely surpasses and transcends the form which we give it.

He then goes on to develop man's sin in this respect, as his sloth. In Christ we are elected and created and determined to be grateful hearers of the Word of God, to be grateful participants in this knowledge of God which He has fulfilled and disclosed and established on our behalf among us, to _know_ that we are elected and created and determined in Him; in Him as our Fellow man, we are turned to other men, elected and created and determined for existence in fellow-humanity; in Him as the man who lives according to the Spirit in peace, as the soul of his body, we are elected, created and determined for this authentically human life; and in that He gave up His life to God, in that He allowed it to be taken from Him, in that He was the Victor in death too, we are determined to move forward to this our end in joy. Man refuses in all cases to follow this direction and in this his sloth consists, but Barth is persistent in pointing out that this refusal is futile. In no sense can that for which man has been elected, created and determined in Jesus Christ be set aside for this is the reality in which he lives. "I may close my eyes, I may shut them as tight as I can, or I may turn away from the sun, but this does not alter the fact that the sun shines on me too, and that I have eyes to see it. I may try to cease or refuse to be the man that I am in that one new man, but I cannot in fact cease to be this man."[46]

---

[45] _Ibid_., p. 383.

The only thing that can be said of this refusal is that it is a fact, a reality of the second order, but as to its ultimate consequences and weight, Barth is quite clear, it is the past being of man, that which is destined to pass away when in the final Parousia, the revelation of Jesus Christ and all things in Him takes place.

The questions raised by such a viewpoint have already been mentioned in the earlier section on Barth's treatment of sin, the questions which really can be put into one: in the light of the extreme objectivity of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation, in the fact that man is in Jesus Christ ontologically, can sin ever be more than a sort of vicious shadow that accompanies this whole movement, a stage which provides the setting for that which takes place, a concept that makes the greater concept of reconciliation meaningful?

---

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 410.

Barth now turns to the positive determination of the anthropological sphere accomplished in Jesus Christ which he entitles: The Sanctification of Man. Even as all men in the judgment which He takes on Himself are justified in Him, so too all men, in the exaltation which comes to Him as the Son of Man are sanctified effectively and authoritatively in Him.[47] Sanctification belongs indissolubly with justification as the result of the one act of salvation that takes place in Jesus Christ.

Of particular interest to the problem of this paper is the second subsection - The Holy One and the Saints.[48] The reconciliation of the world with God in its form of sanctification takes place as God fashions a people of holy men whom in spite of their sin have the freedom, received from Him, to live in it, to represent Him among all other men and to serve Him in what they are and do and suffer.[49]

---

[47] Ibid., p. 499.

[48] The German title: Der Heilige und die Heiligen, expresses the close relation Barth sees between Christ and man sanctified in Him, much better than the English.

[49] C.D., IV/2., p. 511.

Here Barth develops the distinction between a *de iure* and a *de facto* sanctification, a concept fundamental to his whole understanding of reconciliation. The use of these terms is most instructive. At first glance it would appear that he has used them incorrectly. In diplomatic parlance the *de facto* recognition of a government comes first, the simple acknowledgment that a given government has authority over the people within its boundaries, while the question of *de iure* recognition comes later, as the question of the legitimacy of such a government over its people. As everyone knows, it is the *de facto* recognition which is first and all important, for this establishes a relationship between governments and the *de iure* recognition is almost sure to follow and is not really too important in the diplomatic field.

For Barth, however, in using these terms in relation to reconciliation and its effect in the anthropological sphere, the *de iure* question is first and fundamental. It is the *de iure* justification and sanctification which takes place in Christ. In and with His sanctification ours has been achieved and is in force legally. We are already saints in Him apart from the question of recognition. This is the first and fundamental thing, this is the basis for there to be any *de facto* recognition. In faith man sees his *de iure* sanctification and that of the whole world as that which has happened in Him apart from his faith and thus not as a private relationship between Christ and himself but the relationship in which the whole world stands.

> What took place in Him - the exaltation of man, and therefore His sanctification for God - took place as the new impression of humanity as such. It was accomplished in the place of all others. In the exercise of His kingly office it took place for them too: with all the mercy of the love which seeks all; with all the seriousness of the will which extends to all; with all the power of the act which is done for all; with all the authoritativeness of the decision which has been taken for all. In all His singularity Jesus Christ never was or is or will be isolated. For in this singularity He was and is and will be, and worked and will work, from and to all eternity for all. We do not see Him at all if we do not see Him in our place; if we do not therefore see the direct relevance of His being and action for ours; if we do not therefore see ourselves as determined by His being and action. But all this is not a private arrangement between Him and us. He is not merely our Lord and Representative. As He takes our own place He takes also that of our fellows and brothers. The relevance of His being and action is for ours, but also for that of others who are beside and around us in likeness with us. They no less than we are determined by Him. The knowledge of the man Jesus includes the knowledge and enclosure of our own and every other human existence in His. There are, therefore, no saints (and saints are those who know the man Jesus) to whose participation in the sanctity of this One there does not also belong a knowledge of the all-embracing character of His existence in its comprehension not only of themselves but also of the children of the world.[50]

It is just this universal significance of the man Jesus Christ that Calvin neglected according to Barth, in speaking of sanctification, this de iure aspect of sanctification upon which the de facto sanctification which

---

[60] *Ibid*., pp. 519,520.

he described so well has its basis.[51] Here again we come to the heart of the issue which arises from Barth's formulation. Most theologians would agree with Barth that a universal significance must be attached to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, but when this universal significance is seen in such a strictly objective way, then the question arises, as to whether the _de facto_ aspect of reconciliation which has its basis here, is not really relegated to an unimportant and second-rate place. One is reminded again of the formulation of Forsyth, quoted in the Introduction in which the distinction was drawn between reality and actuality and the questionableness of such a distinction. If reconciliation is a reality in Christ, or in effect _de iure_ for all men, is not the talk about actuality, or a _de facto_ reconciliation really quite a subordinate and in the last analysis an insignificant question?

Having laid this foundation in the _de iure_ sanctification of all, Barth goes on to discuss the _de facto_ sanctification of the saints. These are men to whom the objective event of reconciliation is disclosed in its meaning and significance, they are men who interpret their lives in the light of this truth which has been hitherto suppressed, they are men given direction by the Holy

---

[51] _Ibid._, p. 520.

Spirit and thus, though they remain sinners, they are disturbed sinners, radically separated from the rest of mankind which live as undisturbed sinners.

> The people of God in the world are those to whom it is revealed, and who may live in and by the knowledge, that their being as sinners is one which is assailed by God, and therefore basically and definitively; that the ground on which they are sinners has been taken away from them, even though they are still sinners. This is what distinguishes the recipients of the direction of the Son of God from the world which does not share this knowledge - although the ground has already been cut from under its sinful being as well.[52]

Barth fills out the content of this *de facto* sanctification in four subsections: The Call to Discipleship, The Awakening to Conversion, The Praise of Works, The Dignity of the Cross. In all these developments the fundamental thought is that the saints reflect in their lives the life of the Royal Man Jesus Christ. Thus, for example, in speaking of the awakening to conversion, which he describes as being wakened from the relentless downward movement of one's sloth and rising up and moving towards God on the basis of the knowledge that God is for us, Barth goes on to say that this movement of conversion is only real in Jesus Christ. He alone is the One who halts as the old man and advances as the new. What the New Testament describes as conversion can never be equated with what takes place in our own lives. "How feeble is the relationship, even in the best of cases between the great categories in which the conversion of man is described in the New Testament and the corresponding event in our own inner and outer life!"[53] To speak of conversion is to speak of Jesus Christ directly for our conversion is accomplished in His birth, His baptism, His death, His resurrection.[54] The knowledge of faith knows this movement has been fulfilled in Him and that as such it is really ours - and there thus remains to us the little movements of one's own inner and outer life, which reflect this great movement and thus attest it.[55]

---

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 526.

Again the emphasis is clear. As with justification, so with sanctification, it really takes place in Him and Him alone, but if we know Him aright we know that the reality of Jesus Christ includes ourselves, even as the deity of Christ includes His humanity, and there is left for us to reflect in our lives this reality which encompasses us. The adequacy of this concept is open to serious question to which we will turn in the final section of this work.

In the final two sections of this volume: The

---

[53] Ibid., p. 583.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid., p. 584.

Holy Spirit and the Upbuilding of the Christian Community and The Holy Spirit and Christian love, Barth turns to that which is effected by the divine work of sanctification in the anthropological sphere in terms of the Christian community and the individual Christian within it.

Here we see the same basic pattern developed as in volume IV, 1. The objective event of reconciliation which takes place in Jesus Christ includes in its objectivity its subjective disclosure - that Jesus Christ in His totality includes all men in Him and is the reality which determines every man as such. Thus the purpose of the community is "to give a provisional representation of the sanctification of all humanity and human life as it has taken place in Him."[56] It is to be the earthly reality, the earthly-historical form of Jesus Christ as He lives today in the time between His first and His final Parousia in which the sanctification of all men will be fully revealed. In that the community has this form of the living Jesus Christ it has a saving necessity.

Likewise the individual Christian bears witness to the fact that the objective reconciliation has reference to the individual man, to every individual:

> There is no man who does not belong to this man, who is not His brother. But this is true of the Christian in a very special way because his human

---

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 620.

> existence has been altered and re-determined by the fact that what is true of all men is no longer concealed from him but revealed to him; because he, a man like all others, may live in the knowledge that he belongs to Jesus, and live in a very different way from those who do not have this knowledge.[57]

Thus the community and the individual Christian within it have significance because they form part of the totus Christus, because in them Jesus Christ is seen in His true reality as the One in whom all men and all things are included. The community is described as a predicate of His being; He is identified with the community. "He - and in reality only He, but He in supreme reality - is the community."[58] The relationship of Head and body used in the New Testament is thus conceived by Barth in ontological terms.

Again one must reserve a full discussion of this concept until other aspects of Barth's dogmatic work have been elucidated. Once again, though the familiar pattern of his thought is seen: the action of the community and the individual within it, which is in view of man's sanctification described as love, is founded on the prior being of the community and the individual. Because Jesus Christ includes in His being the community and the individual Christian there may be a correspondence, a repetition, an analogous action on their part to that which is their being, in fact, this is the only possibility open to them, for when the reality which determines man becomes a matter of knowledge, how can he do any other but correspond to this reality in his own existence? In short the relationship between Christ and the Christian does not take place in the action of Christ's love which evokes a responsive love on the part of its recipient, but rather because the relationship is already there and in effect, apart from any response, the response being merely the only course open if one is to follow the law of his being.

---

[57] Ibid., p. 727.

[58] Ibid., p. 655.

Chapter IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF BARTH'S THOUGHT IN VOLUME IV/3: JESUS CHRIST, THE TRUE WITNESS

The third and latest volume of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation is entitled: Jesus Christus, Der Wahrhaftige Zeuge.[1] Since this volume in its two parts has only been published recently, at a time when most of the research on this problem was completed, and since the thought of this volume only further develops the line of thought we have already seen in volumes IV, 1 and IV, 2, we will mention its contents more briefly.

As we have seen in our previous discussion, the one act of reconciliation comprises three things: God's humbling of Himself in the Person of His Son in order to take man's place and bear the judgment that is man's on Himself, or the High Priestly work of Christ; the elevation of man to fellowship with God, which takes place in and with God's humbling of Himself, or the Kingly work of Christ; and the fact that this act of humiliation and exaltation is an event that encompasses the life of every man and calls forth participation in it on the part of the community acting on behalf of all mankind, or the Prophetic work of Jesus Christ.

---

[1] As this last volume has not been translated into English, quotations are given from the German; otherwise the translation is that of the writer.

It is to this third and last element that Barth turns in this volume, to the fact that reconciliation is revelation, that it is truth, that it speaks, that it shines as a light, that it is a communicative event. "Das dritte Problem der Versöhnungslehre ist uns also schlicht damit vorgegeben und aufgegeben, dass die Versöhnung sich, indem sie geschieht, auch kundgibt."[2] Man's justification and sanctification include also his calling, his pride and sloth include also his lie, his gathering and upbuilding include also his sending, his Christian faith and love include Christian hope.

It is here that we come to the very center of Barth's thought on the question of subjective appropriation and see in clear focus the distinctive way he treats this subject. The fact that reconciliation becomes active and visible in the lives of men is because it has a christological basis, because it is an event in and of itself in Jesus Christ, because it belongs to His prophetic office, and only because of this objective basis does it become an event in the lives of men.

> Sie ist in sich selber auch da Erkenntnisgrund, wo ihr keines Menschen Erkenntnis entspricht. Sie redet, sie zeigt sich an, sie verherrlicht sich, sie ist transeunt und kommunikativ, bevor sie, und insofern auch, ohne dass sie in der Kreaturwelt, in der sie geschieht, zu ihren Zielen kommt, beruht eben darauf, dass sie zuvor, dass sie in sich selbst transeunt, kommunikativ ist, sich selbst ansagt, anzeigt, verherrlicht.[3]

---

[2] K.D., IV/3/1, pp. 8, 9.

[3] Ibid., p. 9.

The revelationary character of reconciliation has its ground in the event of reconciliation itself and this objectivity must be stressed, for it is quite easy here to dissolve this problem into one of the knowledge, understanding and clarification of reconciliation rather than as part of the doctrine of reconciliation as such.[4] The priority of the light of the event of reconciliation, of Jesus Christ Himself, must be stressed before any question of human enlightenment and knowledge. He is made unto us wisdom and truth in the same way that He is made unto us justification and sanctification.

Thus Barth follows the pattern with which we have grown familiar in our study of the previous volumes. Reconciliation in this third dimension - as revelation, as a communicative event, in its character of reaching out into the lives of others - is a reality in itself, before man's participation in it, even as man's justification and sanctification take place outside of him. The difficulty here is that this dimension of reconciliation seems to intensify the problem of speaking of this as having meaning in itself apart from man's participation in it, for the very thing that is objectively valid apart from man's participation is his participation, the fact that reconciliation reaches out to his life and enters it, determining his existence.

---

[4] Ibid., p. 10.

Nevertheless Barth takes this course, and the christological section - Die Herrlichkeit des Mittlers - is a development of the fact that reconciliation is a revelationary event in and of itself with the usual concluding subsection to explain its bearing and relevance for the anthropological sphere.

Barth develops his thought on the Person and Work of Christ under the titles - The Light of Life and Jesus is Victor. In the fact that He, Jesus Christ lives, God and the world are seen as being truly together and existing in "unangreifbarer und unauflöslicher Koexistenz und Verbindung."[5] God does not live without this One, nor does the world live without Him, and this fact is good news, for this being together of God and the world in Him is not merely an ontological fact but it means the saving of the world, the fulfillment of the covenant. It is salvation history (Heilsgeschichte) encompassing all events and being carried out in the favor of all men. "Indem Jesus Christus lebt, leben Gott und Mensch in dieser Verbindung: kein Gott für sich hier und kein Mensch für sich dort, sondern Gott als der Gott des Menschen und der Mensch als der Mensch Gottes."[6] This is the order of reconciliation, the order of grace, the order of God's free mercy, which is the eternal meaning and content of the order of creation, and it is a reality in that Jesus Christ lives, it has its worth, its value, its power, in this fact. In that He lives, salvation history is the reality in which all men live their lives.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 42.

[6] Ibid., p. 45.

Moreover, His life speaks of this reality; He is His own authentic witness, and though this statement arises as a confession of faith, the fact that He lives in such a way is no production of faith, but rather there is faith because He lives as the light which calls it forth. All of this can be summarised in this one statement: "dass Jesus Christus, indem er lebt, für sich selber spricht, sein eigener authentischer Zeuge ist und damit Erkenntnis seiner selbst, Erkenntnis seines Lebens von sich aus begründet, hervorruft, schafft, wirklich und damit möglich macht."[7]

From this point Barth goes on to show how Christ's prophetic office is to be understood in terms of His own being and life act. The prophet's task is to bring to expression the will and action of God toward His people, proclaiming to the people to take knowledge of, to take to heart that which God has done. Jesus Christ in this sense is the prophet _sui generis_, for His life-act is the deed of God and He also proclaims Himself as the deed of God. "Er spricht den göttlichen Logos, indem er selbst dieser Logos, die Wahrheit, die Offenbarung, der Name, das Licht Gottes ist. Seine Ausübung des Apostolates fällt mit seiner Berufung dazu und es fallen beide mit seinem Leben als solchem als dem Leben des Offenbarers **zusammen.**"[8]

---

[7] _Ibid._, p. 49.

It is within this general framework that Barth develops his thought on the person of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the light of life insofar as He proves Himself to be so, there can be no authenticating of Him as this light on independent grounds. The light that shines is the light of His life which is the life of the true Son of God who as such is also the true Son of Man, the life of the fulfilled covenant, the life of reconciliation. In this life He speaks, saying that it is about us and for us, He speaks out what He is to and for us, and in that is He the prophet.[9]

And He is the light of life for the world. This is one of the things Barth stresses throughout this section. His prophetic office is not directed only to the church, only to believers, for such an approach is only a blind alley (Sackgasse); rather it is directed to the world. This comes out in an especially forceful way where Barth speaks of the relation of Jesus Christ as the one Word of God to all other words - the one Truth in relation to other truths. Here in a very ingenious way he attempts to recognise the validity of other realms of knowledge and truth without succumbing to a natural theology. Because Jesus Christ is the one Word of God to the world and to every man, and is this Word objectively, irrespective of man's response to Him, the world is capable of words and truths that bear witness to Him.

---

[8] _Ibid_., p. 53.

[9] _Ibid_., p. 111.

> Wer mit den Propheten und Aposteln von seiner Auferstehung und also von seiner Offenbarung als der, der er war, ist und sein wird, herkommen, wer ihn als den, der er war, ist und sein wird, erkennen und bekennen darf, der erkennt und bekennt eben damit, dass nicht nur er, nicht nur die in der Nachfolge der Propheten und Apostel an ihn glaugende, ihn liebende, auf ihn hoffende Gemeinde, sondern *de iure* jeder Mensch, ja die ganze Kreatur von seinem Kreuz, von der in ihm geschehenen Versöhnung herkommit, von ihr her zum Schauplatz seiner Herrschaft und so auch zum Empfänger und Träger seines Wortes bestimmt ist.[10]

Barth sees in this solution of his, incidently, the solution to the problem of the two Kingdoms, to the relation between the order of creation and the order of reconciliation. All human truth is relativised by the fact that He is the one Truth, the one Word, but in that all words and truths come from Him, they are integrated and given their place, and thus both a monism and dualism are avoided.[11] This particular aspect of Barth's thought will come more to the fore in our study of his doctrines of creation and election.

---

[10] *Ibid*., p. 130.

As with His office as High Priest and King, so too the Prophetic office of Jesus Christ takes place as a history, and it is to this aspect that Barth turns in the subsection: Jesus ist Sieger. The fact that the covenant is word, that the reconciliation is revelation, that Jesus Christ is the Prophet, happens, it takes place as an event.

The title of this subsection expresses the dynamic nature of this event revealing this history as a struggle, but as a struggle in which there is no equivalence between the forces battling one another, for Jesus Christ is Lord over the contradiction that is set against Him.[12] Barth sees this statement as referring to the problem of the perception of the event of reconciliation, to the question of how it happens that His history, that of the humiliated Son of God and exalted Son of Man - is not hidden but perceived, how it is that men come to Jesus Christ as their fellow man and brother.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 174.

[12] In connection with this title, Barth pauses to answer the charges of Berkouwer directly, and indirectly the criticisms of many of his students - that in his exaltation of the triumph of grace he does not take seriously the reality of evil. He defends his position as taking the fact that Jesus Christ is Victor seriously and thus not viewing His triumph as either problematical or disputable. Here it might be noted that the validity of this reply stands only if one accepts Barth's extremely objective thought that in Jesus Christ alone everything that has meaning and importance takes place.

Jesus Christ as prophet knows and proclaims the will of God taking place in His own existence and thus the event of revelation and light is included in the event of reconciliation. In this event the apparent distance between reconciliation and us men is crossed over so that we find ourselves one way or another in this event as such. "Indem es als Wort laut und vernehmbar wird, engagiert es uns, vernehmen wir Menschen, dass das Geschehen der Versöhnung, von dem es redet, ein Geschehen für uns und an uns ist: ein Geschehen, an dem wir so beteiligt sind, dass wir anders als in der Beteiligung an ihm gar nicht existieren können."[13]

This fact, that the event of revelation happens in Him, means that all men are included in it. In that the event of reconciliation is also the event of revelation, in that men who are truly justified and sanctified are also called, in that Jesus Christ as High Priest and King is also Prophet, our place apart from this event is destroyed and our distance from it is overcome.

---

[13] K.D., IV/3/1, p. 207.

> Was das auch subjektiv für uns bedeuten oder nicht bedeuten, wie sich das auch in unserem Bewusstsein spiegeln mag: indem die Versöhnung auch Offenbarung ist, indem Jesus Christus auch als Prophet lebt und wirkt, ist es objektiv aus mit unserer Ferne von ihm, haben wir ihm gegenüber keinen privaten Raum, sind wir in seinen Raum einbezogen: einbezogen in das, was in ihm geschieht, wird uns ihr Geschehen objektiv zur eigenen Erfahrung, widerfährt uns hier, was dort geschieht: in jenem nur vermeintlichen, nur scheinbaren blossen Dort, das in Wahrheit unser Hier in sich schliesst, in welchem auch unser Hier dort ist. Eben dass des Menschen Hier (und er selbst in seinem Hier) in Wahrheit dort, dass das Dort jener Geschichte in Wahrheit heir seine eigene Geschichte ist - das eröffnet sich, indem die Versöhnung auch Offenbarung ist, indem Jesus Christus auch als Prophet handelt.[14]

The great bulk of this subsection is devoted to a detailed description of the prophetic work of Jesus Christ. In sum this work is that in which Jesus Christ makes Himself known to man, confronting man with Himself and opening him up to the knowledge of Himself, a work that takes place against the background of opposition in which man seeks to live as though this were not the one reality of which he is a part, but which opposition is in no way equal to His prophetic work. In His prophetic work His history which happens then and there breaks out from its singularity in its own power, transcends itself, and enters into the world, encroaching on all events, stamping them with its law. The Word of God goes out and brings forth fruit. "Indem die in Jesus Christus geschehene

---

[14] *Ibid*., pp. 208, 9.

Heilsgeschichte sich als solche mitteilt und also auch Offenbarungsgeschichte ist, schafft sie, sich selbst reproduzierend, hinübergreifend in die Geschichte der Welt und der Menschen, in Gestalt der christlichen Erkenntnis wiederum Heilsgeschichte..."[15]

Thus we have here the development of Barth's concept of the _totus Christus_ mentioned earlier in his work when he spoke of the Christian community. To say Jesus Christ aright is to say Jesus Christ and His people, Jesus Christ and Christian knowledge of Him, or perhaps to put it more strongly, the believing subject who has knowledge of the high priestly and kingly activity of Jesus Christ and so of his justification and sanctification, who has his hypostasis in Jesus Christ. Furthermore, because this is a reality in Jesus Christ apart from man's knowledge of it, the validity of the noetic, the subjective aspect of reconciliation, is established firmly with no possibility of the ontic or objective swallowing it up or of it on its part swallowing up the ontic.

> Heilsgeschichte ist das Ausgehen des Säemanns zusammen mit dem Aufgehen und Fruchtbringen des von ihm ausgeworfenen Samens - ist aber auch dieses Aufgehen und Fruchtbringen zusammen mit dem Sein and Tun des Säemanns. Heilsgeschichte ist die Geschichte des dem Saul von Tarsus begegnenden Jesus von Nazareth, zusammen mit der Geschichte des diesen Jesus als den Christus erkennenden und als solchen verkündigenden Apostels Paulus...

---

[15] _Ibid_., p. 242.

> Heilsgeschichte ist die Geschichte des totus Christus, des Hauptes mit seinem Leib und mit allen seinen Gliedern.[16]

Because the founding of Christian knowledge is included in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ it must be seen that reconciliation itself happens here, even as it does in His high priestly and kingly work. "In der durch das Offenbarwerden der Versöhnung begründeten christlichen Erkenntnis geschieht die Versöhnung."[17] True Christian knowledge is an event in which the object seizes and takes the initiative and in which the subject, the whole man in his total life is turned about in an 180 degree turn, to receive the object and be completely directed by it.

> In christlicher Erkenntnis wird und ist Jesus Christus dem Menschen real präsent, tut er, was er für ihn tut, auch an und in ihm, gibt er ihm die Freiheit, die Erlaubnis und das Gebot, der zu sein, der er in ihm ist: die in ihm neu gewordene Kreatur, der in ihm gerechtfertigte und geheiligte Sünder, sein Bruder und also Gottes Kind und so verantwortlicher Zeuge der in ihm geschehenen Versöhnung.[18]

The rest of this subsection is devoted to an exposition of how this triumph of Jesus as Victor takes place and is not integral to the problem of our study. What is important to see is how Barth has attempted to give Christian subjectivity its place and at the same time made of it part of the objective event of Jesus Christ and thus part of the event of reconciliation that takes place in Him. The one event of reconciliation is also revelation. Jesus Christ lives, His life encroaches upon every life determining all things; He breaks into man's life so that man can live in the knowledge of the reconciliation that has taken place in Him, and this event is as much a part of reconciliation as the justification and sanctification of man to which he is called to take knowledge. The man who comes to this knowledge knows that he is actually partaking in Heilsgeschichte in that he has a part in this knowledge.

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 246, 247.

[17] Ibid., p. 249.

[18] Ibid., p. 252.

The question which must be asked here is does this concept do justice to the New Testament description of Christian experience? There is no doubt that the New Testament speaks of the awakening to the knowledge of Jesus Christ as part of the event of reconciliation itself, but can this experience be described as simply taking knowledge of the fact that one is objectively a part of the totus Christus, of the fact that the justification and sanctification of the world and of all men is also his of the fact that Jesus Christ determines his life, whereas before he was unaware of it? Or does not the whole event of reconciliation take place in the relationship of faith in which the Christian enters into a relationship with Jesus Christ in which He is his Justifier and Sanctifier, but outside of which relationship there is no question of justification and sanctification. And is he not established as a witness, not to call other men into a knowledge of their salvation, but to call them into the relationship in which salvation becomes a reality? However, we will leave the development of this criticism to a later section.

In the final subsection - The Promise of the Spirit - Barth turns to the question of how that which is reality in the christological sphere can be spoken of as having relevance and importance for the anthropological sphere. Jesus Christ Himself is the answer to this question for He is the elected One of God in whom also His own are elected, and therefore the anthropological sphere is not apart from the christological. However, it is only in the resurrection that His being for us is revealed. In this event "den Abgrund zwischen ihm und uns schliessend."[19] There it is revealed in full certainty that He is with us to the end of the days.

Here Barth develops an idea mentioned throughout these volumes, namely, that the Easter event is one form of the Parousia of Jesus Christ - the Parousia being understood as the revelation of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ in His preceding life and death - a form which is followed by another in which He comes again through the mediatorship of the Holy Spirit, and which in turn is followed by the final form in which He appears and manifests Himself as the goal of all history.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 326.

It is the Parousia which is most intimately connected with His prophetic work, for here the reconciliation of the world breaks out of its hiddenness and becomes active in the world. Thus in the resurrection:

> die in ihm schon vollzogene Veränderung der Situation zwischen Gott und Welt dadurch aktualisiert wurde, dass sie auch in noetischer Gestalt, auch als Jesu Christi Prophetie unmittelbar und vollkommen Ereignis wurde, ihrer Verborgenheit entnommen, der Welt offenbar und bekannt gemacht, dass sie an jeden Menschen herangebracht und so zu einem Faktor der Existenz der Welt und eines jeden Menschen gemacht wurde, mit dessen Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit von da ab unweigerlich zu rechnen ist.[20]

In the resurrection this world is given a new character and form; its reconciliation shines in it, apart from human hearing and obeying.[21] In His resurrection the heavenly realm actually enters into the world and because of this the determination of the world is universal. Barth is emphatic on this point. The community is not sent into the world to be the means by which the salvation of the world created in Jesus Christ and revealed in His resurrection first must be imparted.

---

[20] *Ibid*., p. 342.

[21] *Ibid*., p. 345.

> Nein, die christliche Sendung hat ihren ontologischen Grund, hat auch ihre praktische Basis und ihren sicheren Ausgangspunkt im Universalismus der Osteroffenbarung selbst, in der jene Mitteilung des Heils an die ganze Welt durch den, der dazu allein die Autorität und die Kraft hat, schon geschehen ist. Himmel und Erde, Engel und Menschen und alle Kreaturen sind in der Auferstehung Jesu Christi schon in das durchdringende, verändernde Licht seiner Person und seines Werkes gerückt, sind schon von jenem Feuer erfasst, sind durch ihn selbst, durch das Anheben seines prophetischen Werkes schon darüber unterrichtet, wie es mit ihnen auf Grund dessen, was in ihm und durch ihn geschah, bestellt ist. Sie sind schon durch seine lebendige Gegenwart und Aktion in ihrer Mitte angeklagt und gerichtet, aber auch getröstet und erfreut. Sie nehmen und haben schon Anteil an der geschehenen Versöhnung, an dem erfüllten Bund: den Anteil, den er ihnen, indem er in ihrer Mitte von den Toten auferstand, geben wollte und gegeben hat.[22]

But if one accepts this explanation of the resurrection one must go on, as Barth does, to ask why the world did not cease with the resurrection. If in His resurrection Jesus Christ reveals the salvation of the world why does the world go on as if this salvation had not been revealed? The reason is not because of any lack in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, but because He wills to allow space and time for His struggle in order that the community can follow after Him:

> das 'noch nicht,' in welchem die Welt, die Gemeinde, - wir alle existieren, hat seinen Grund

---

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 350, 351.

> darin, dass es Jesu Christi guter Wille ist, seinerseits noch nicht am Ziel, noch auf dem Wege zu sein und dass der ganzen in ihm versöhnten Kreatur nichts Anderes übrig bleibt, als an seiner Situation teilzunehmen, ihr entsprechend und angepasst zu existieren.[23]

And one must go even further, for in allowing time and space for men to take an actual share in the event of reconciliation God affirms His being and deed as the electing God "in welchem und mit welchem auch die Kreatur erwählt ist: nicht um in ihm zu verschwinden und aufzugehen, nicht um nur der Gegenstand seines Wirkens, sondern um in ihm und durch ihn Gottes freie Kreatur zu sein."[24] Even as the humanity of the Son of God is no dead passive thing, but active in its union with the Son of God, following after God and thus being in the highest sense free, so mankind in general is to give this active confirmation of its being in Christ and in so doing exercise its greatest and only freedom.

All men thus come from the resurrection and go forward to meet His final appearing taking part in the struggle that is His essentially, in which the light conquers the darkness - all, Christian and non-Christian alike, for He is the hope of all.[25] But this does not mean that the time in between the first and final Parousia is left to man, rather the whole point of this subsection is that He is active here and now, in the time in between, through the Holy Spirit.

---

[23] Ibid., p. 380.

[24] Ibid., p. 383.

[25] Ibid., p. 399.

In the action of the Holy Spirit the going out and entrance of the prophecy of Jesus Christ to us in our realm takes place. Through the Spirit Jesus Christ actually gives the definite promise of His final appearance, of the conclusion of the reconciliation of the world in Him, and the promise of His presence and support now, directing a man's temporal existence to this final future. This is the promise that comes to the Christian man. But the Spirit is also promised to the non-Christian in just that way that He comes to the Christian.

> Daran kann ja keine Abwendung, keine Revolte und Resistenz und Ungebühr des Nicht-Christen etwas ändern, dass auch er in der von Gott gut, nämlich als äusserer Grund des Bundes und so auch zu seinem Heil geschaffenen - mehr noch: in der in Erfüllung dieses Bundes, in Vollstreckung der Erwählung, in der auch er erwählt ist, in Jesus Christus versöhnten Welt, dass auch er als ein mit Gott Versöhnter existiert.[26]

In that a man does not yet have the Spirit, does not yet know Jesus Christ, he is as a dam seeking to hold back a river, a dam which is far too weak in relation to the strong flood, to have any final validity.[27]

As we have seen throughout this paper again and again Barth works consciously or unconsciously with the concepts of _an_ and _en hypostasia_ as the key to interpreting the relation of Christ and mankind. The fact that mankind has its being in the being of Jesus Christ is fundamental to the objectivity of his doctrine of reconciliation, and the further fact, that it is part of the one event of reconciliation that this being in Jesus Christ be actively reflected in the lives of men, allows him to make of the event of taking knowledge of Jesus Christ part of the one event of reconciliation itself. But Barth is faced with the obvious empirical fact that not all men correspond to this their being and it is here that this whole conceptual framework is threatened, for either one must admit the inadequacy of such concepts to express the relation between the event of reconciliation and man's response to it, or else find refuge in speaking of a superior reality which overrules the contradiction in which man lives and which is really to be taken as the truth of this man in spite of anything he does in his life-act.

---

[26] *Ibid*., p. 410.

[27] *Ibid*., p. 411. Note the impersonal imagery Barth employs here.

It is the latter course which Barth chooses consistently, as we have seen throughout this study of his doctrine of reconciliation. The question that comes to mind in all this though, is does not Barth in order to preserve the very beautiful system that he has worked out here, not in reality remove the Gospel from its encounter with man as he is? The New Testament proclamation is not that every man is a new creature in Christ despite himself, and that he should live according to this his one determination, corresponding in his life-act to the reality of which he is a part, but that man may become a new creature through a relationship with Jesus Christ, a relationship that is made possible as Christ through His Holy Spirit accompanies the proclamation of the Church and thus powerfully enables the message of the Church to turn man to Himself in faith.

Along these same lines it is also difficult to see why Barth has such a passion for establishing the ontological ground that all men are in Christ, as that which gives the community its authority for proclamation. In the relationship of faith in Jesus Christ the community and the individual within the community experiences reconciliation with God and experiences this reconciliation as unmerited and undeserved. The Christian knows he is accepted despite his unacceptability, that he is a forgiven sinner; and this in itself seems a sufficient basis to turn him toward his neighbor as a witness of the Lord who has been gracious to him.

The remaining sections: Man's Lie and Condemnation, The Calling of Man, The Holy Spirit and the Sending of the Christian Community and the Holy Spirit and Christian Hope, apply that which has been learned from the christological sphere to the anthropological sphere in the way we have grown accustomed to expect.

Man's sin is seen as the lie with which he seeks to encounter and oppose the word of truth, the word of God's grace, which meets him in Jesus Christ, the especially Christian form of sin in which man seeks to resist the truth which has already seized him. It is however, also the sin of every man since all men stand objectively in His light, the sin in which man by seeking to escape the one light in which he can live actually bids God to damn him, but is nevertheless not damned because the truth in which he lives is greater than this lie.

This is the negative meaning of man's life in the light that shines from Jesus Christ. Positively, the fact that Jesus Christ is light means that all men are called by Him:

> Indem inmitten der Weltgeschichte die Geschichte Israels und die Geschichte Jesu Christi geschehen u.zw. leuchtend, für sich selbst sprechend geschehen ist, indem inmitten aller Menschen auch der Mensch Jesus Christus lebt, sich selbst und die in ihm vollbrachte Versöhnungstat, die Erfüllung des Bundes zwischen Gott und Mensch verkündigt, ist a priori darüber entschieden: dass es kein menschliches Herz, kein menschliches Denken, Wollen und Streben gibt, dem es nicht bestimmt wäre, durch das Werk des Heiligen Geistes eben in Ihm seinen Meister zu finden, aus einem unberufenen zu einem berufenen, aus einem heidnischen zu einem christlichen Herzen, Denken und Wollen zu werden.[28]

---

[28] K.D., IV/3/2, p. 565.

Human existence is determined as co-existence with the existence of the God-man Jesus Christ. Each man is destined to be a hearer of the Word of God.

In the actual calling of man himself, Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit confronts a man in his time and history with the revelation of Himself, bringing man to a knowledge of the truth, to a knowledge of Himself, enlightening and illuminating him, making him free to know Him. A man who is called exists in analogy to the existence of Jesus Christ, in repetition, confirmation and revelation not only of the way, but also of the will and action of God, being set in this way in fellowship with Jesus Christ. His life now is that of a witness, for he follows after Christ who is now with him in his time and space, serving Him as Lord giving Him the place of honor and authority and in so doing is free in the highest sense. The words of the Christian can thus reflect the light of His prophetic work, announcing, testifying to the whole world of their reconciliation.[29] However, in no way is Christ dependent on this witness, but He simply wills to have it, not to be Christ without it. Because of this, the Christian in bearing witness, will never point to his own experience but to the act of reconciliation which took place in His Person apart from his experience.

---

[29] _Ibid_., p. 698.

This calling is expressed in the life of the Christian community and in the life of individual Christians. The Spirit of Jesus Christ entrusts to His earthly-historical form of existence the service of His prophetic word and therein the provisional representation of the calling going forth from Him to the whole world. The community confesses to the world that the covenant concluded in Jesus Christ between God and man is the first and final meaning of their history and that this future revelation is their great hope, living and active already in the present.[30] The community knows the grace of God which has overcome the contradiction of the world's evil, it knows that the world has been reconciled to God in Jesus Christ, it sees that all have become new in Him, and it holds to this fact and follows it in active obedience. Thus its witness is directed to the world and the content of this witness is good news:

> Wir sagen jetzt zusammenfassend: der Gemeinde ist das Evangelium aufgetragen: die gute, die fröhliche Botschaft von Jesus Christus, von der wirklichen Tat und von der wahren Offenbarung der Güte, in der Gotte sich selbst zum Gott des Menschen, den Menschen zu seinem Menschen machen wollte und gemacht hat. Diese grosse Ja ist ihre Sache.[31]

With regards to the individual, he partakes in the life of the community as one who may stride forward in hope towards God in His future, hoping for the salvation of the whole world, for the completed justification and sanctification of all and for the judgment of his service of witness, and in that this future for which he hopes is the completed revelation of Jesus Christ, he already participates in it to some extent in this life, living in dynamic, practical correspondence to that dynamic practical reality.

---

[30] *Ibid*., p. 780.

[31] *Ibid*., p. 916.

These two sections, as can be seen, follow closely to the corresponding sections in volumes IV, 1 and IV, 2, and thus there is no need for a lengthy exposition. The life of the community and the individual Christian is where men exist in correspondence to their true reality, and in that part of man's true reality is that this corresponding action takeplace, this action itself is part of the event of reconciliation.

Thus we have before us the development of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation as it relates to the problem of this thesis. One cannot help but be impressed with the profundity of his thought on this subject and the intricate yet basically simple structure in which this thought is framed. The architectonic, or perhaps better, the symphonic proportions of this work are unmistakable. The theme of the great first movement - God's humbling of Himself to take the place of man - leads irresistibly to the development of the second movement - man's exaltation to fellowship with God - and these two movements together drive forward to the third and final movement in which the one melody which runs throughout both movements joyfully shines forth and is just as joyfully heard and received.

More important than any observation on the structure of this work, however, is the actual answer it seeks to give to the problem of our study. If Barth's thought is acceptable then we can quite simply say that the problem concerning the relationship between objective and subjective elements in the event of reconciliation has been solved. The objective and subjective aspects of reconciliation have been related to one another in such a way that the objective event - Jesus Christ - includes in Himself the subjective response needed in order for reconciliation to be completed. a subjective response which includes the response of every man. Furthermore, in this relationship in which the subjective is included in the objective, the two elements are seen as necessary and important and are integrated in such a way that one does not absorb the other.

But all throughout this study we have been accompanied with certain doubts, certain reservations, which have caused us to pause and question the sufficiency of the solution itself. Is it really adequate to say that reconciliation takes place completely and unreservedly in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ, that He Himself makes the human response which is necessary in reconciliation, and that man's place is to know this reality and exist in an analogous way to it, which analogous existence itself is included in the one reality of Jesus Christ? Or again, is the _de iure_ and _de facto_ distinction that Barth draws between the event of reconciliation as it applies to all men in general and to Christians in particular a satisfactory one? Or yet again, does not Barth, despite all his protests to the contrary speak of sin in an Hegelian manner, as a sort of necessary accompaniment to God's grace, as part of the tutorial equipment needed by the divine Teacher?

In sum, is Barth, as he has been accused by some of his critics, guilty of a form of Christomonism, which while attempting to give a place to the subjective side of reconciliation by including it as part of the objective content of this event, in actuality absorbs the subjective in the objective, or makes of the subjective at the most a noetic experience, an experience which is definitely subordinate to the objective event and which in the last analysis is unimportant in that it does not in the least change the reality of man's relationship with God? Does not Barth's treatment of this subject run the risk of presenting reconciliation as a divine drama, played out above the life of man, as a _tour de force_ accomplished by God for man which is man's heritage whatever man does on the plane of his historical existence?

However, before entering into a direct discussion of these reservations, it will be instructive to examine Barth's thought more fully on some of these very questions, as he has developed it specifically in other sections of his dogmatics.

Part II. THE CLARIFICATION OF BARTH'S SOLUTION FROM OTHER SECTIONS OF HIS DOGMATIC WORK

Chapter V. BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF SIN AND EVIL AND OF HUMAN FREEDOM AS DEVELOPED IN VOLUMES III/1 AND III/3

There are three areas of Barth's thought which seem especially important in relation to his doctrine of reconciliation and the relation of objective and subjective elements within this event: his teaching on sin and evil and in relation to this his understanding of human freedom; his doctrine of man in terms of the relationship of anthropology to christology; and above all his doctrine of election which has emerged throughout this study as being of primary importance and apart from which an understanding of Barth's thought remains closed. When we come to Barth's doctrine of election we will see how his whole understanding of subjectivity as being included in objectivity - the concept of the totus Christus - has its foundation here and how one's acceptance or rejection of Barth's thought on this question depends on whether or not one can follow him at this point.[1]

Without a doubt Barth's treatment of sin and evil has proved to many to be a major stumbling block in his theology. We have seen the main outlines of his viewpoint in the doctrine of reconciliation where he refuses to treat man's sin independently of and apart from reconciliation, but rather as part of the knowledge that comes to man in and with the event of reconciliation.

---

[1] von Balthasar, Hans Urs, Karl Barth: Darstellung und Deutung Seiner Theologie; Köln, Verlag Jakob Hegner, 1951, p. 186.

Barth does not do this simply because he realises that in God's condescension to man in Jesus Christ and man's rejection of this condescension, sin is revealed in its fullest form and in its final depth and perversity. It would be difficult to find a serious theologian who would take any exception to this.

Rather for Barth, sin is to be seen solely and exclusively in God's act to man in Jesus Christ. Only in the fact that God humbles Himself and takes the place of man, is man seen and known as the man of pride; only in the fact that in Jesus Christ man is exalted to fellowship with God is his life revealed as one of sloth and laziness; only in the fact that in Jesus Christ this reconciliation breaks forth as revelation and light, is man's life revealed as a lie; only in the light of Jesus Christ, the second Adam, who is in reality the first Adam, the true man in whom all other men have their humanity, is the first Adam, who is in reality the second Adam, seen for what he is. In short comprehension of sin takes place within the event of reconciliation in which sin itself is overcome and set aside.

This is not to say that there was no knowledge of sin until the historical life of Jesus Christ, or that there is no knowledge of sin now except among Christians, i.e., those who know the reality of reconciliation. Rather, since reconciliation, the humanity of God, is the content of God's eternal decree, and since the resurrection raises the historical fulfilment of this decree into the realm of primal history, this is an event which encompasses the life of every man, the reality in which we all live our lives, the ontological situation into which we are placed and because of which knowledge of sin can take place before and apart from the knowledge of the Incarnation.[2]

We have already mentioned the fact that Barth sees this approach to sin as the only approach which actually does take sin seriously, for only when sin is seen as that which opposes God's eternal decree, and as that which has been eternally nullified and set aside is it seen as sin. But more fundamental to Barth's thought here than his attempt to take sin seriously is his attempt to by-pass what Berkouwer calls a step-wise concept of God's activity which portrays sin as that which disrupts God's will and intention in creation and in response to which reconciliation is directed. For Barth such a conceptuality is disastrous for it makes God's grace seem like an after-thought with God. The manner of reconciliation is affected by sin, but it is not called into being by it. God's humiliation and man's exaltation is not a contingent event, in which God answers the sin of man by firing a final all-powerful salvo into the battle and thus gains victory at the last moment. Such a view smacks too much of dualism, it says too much about that which opposes God, it is in a real sense far too anthropomorphic.

---

[2] Bouillard comments on the tendency in Barth which would see a universal docetic presence of Christ in all the texts of the two Testaments, op. cit., v. 2, p. 192.

Barth's answer to this step-wise procedure which one finds in both Luther and Calvin and also in Protestant orthodoxy, is his attempt to make the covenant, or reconciliation the first of God's acts, viewing creation and all that follows creation as the external basis which provides space and time for the covenant to unfold. But the question which comes to the fore in this development in relation to the doctrine of sin is whether Barth does not with this solution to the defects he finds in a step-wise characterisation of God's activity, completely fail in his intention to take sin seriously. Again this question is raised by the extreme objectivity of his solution. Even as one must ask whether or not the correspondence of man in his life to the reality of reconciliation is of any ultimate importance in view of the fact that reconciliation is in effect in Jesus Christ apart from and independent of this correspondence and response, so one must ask whether or not sin is taken seriously when it is seen as that which has been objectively defeated and set aside from the beginning, having only the strength of a defeated enemy. By putting reconciliation before sin does not one run the risk of treating sin merely as a needed backdrop or stage upon which the drama of reconciliation may run its course?

It is at this point that Lutheran theologians seem especially critical of Barth. Gustaf Wingren accuses Barth of painting sin and evil as illusory forces, since they have already been defeated and can only be known as defeated powers,[3] and Regin Prenter takes issue with Barth over his whole understanding of the relation of the covenant and creation and the resulting supralapsarian manner in which he speaks of the opposition between God and that which opposes Him.[4] One can also find the same criticism in Calvin's Institutes where he recognises the inconsistencies involved in a step-wise presentation of the order - creation, sin, reconciliation, -

---

[3] Wingren, Gustaf, Theology in Conflict: Nygren, Barth, Bultmann, trans. by Eric Wallstrom, Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1958, pp. 37, 38.

[4] Prenter, R., Die Einheit von Schöpfung und Erlosung. Zur Schöpfungslehre Karl Barths; Theologische Zeitschrift, v. 2, Basel, Friedrich Reinhardt A.G., 1946, p. 178.

yet attests this as needed if the reality of reconciliation is to be affirmed.[5]

The questionableness of Barth's view on sin and evil comes out especially in two sections of his dogmatic work, in addition to its exposition in the doctrine of election which we will consider later and the already considered treatment of the subject in his doctrine of reconciliation, namely, in volume III, 1 which treats of God the Creator and III, 3 which treats of the relation of God to His creature, or the doctrine of Providence.

As is well known most of volume III, 1 is given over to an exegesis of the two creation narratives of Genesis, an exegesis in which the covenant is seen as the very foundation and basis for creation. In the first narrative - Genesis 1:1-2:4a - creation is viewed as the external basis of the covenant, and in the second narrative - 2:4b - 2:25 - the covenant is portrayed as the internal basis of creation. This study is not the place to enter into a discussion of Barth's exegesis of these passages except to say that this particular writer while finding here undoubted flashes of brilliance and insight, fails to find a serious attempt to exegete what the Hebrew writer had in mind and intended to say.

---

[5] Calvin, op. cit., II, 16, 2-4.

It is in his exegesis of Genesis 1:2, which is most important for our particular study, that both these attributes - Barth's individual brilliance and his forced exegesis - are best seen. Barth sees this verse as indicating that possibility "which God in His creative decision has ignored and despised, like a human builder when he chooses one specific work and rejects and ignores another, or it may be many others, leaving them unexecuted."[6] The picture described in verse two is the world which was negated, rejected, ignored and left behind in God's actual creation, the possibility which God rejects, namely the possibility that the world could be without the Word of God. It is the past of the real cosmos created by the Word of God that is spoken of in verse two.[7]

However, this past, this chaos, has its reality in its own absurd way in that it is the object of God's rejection, of His not-willing. "It is only behind God's back that the sphere of chaos can assume this distinctive and self-contradictory character of reality."[8] But because it does have this reality, its shadow lies over the real cosmos created by God and it can happen that the creature will look past the Word of God which is the ground and measure of its own reality, seeking to return to its essential past, to this state of chaos, loving that which God hated in His love as the Creator.

---

[6] C.D., III/1, p. 108.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

This can all happen because the creature is non-divine and thus to posit it at all involves a risk on God's part. Yet it is a risk in relation to which God is more than a match. "That His creative Word can be forgotten and despised by man in the world created by Him - with all the consequences which this must bring - cannot prevent Him from remaining bound to this world by His Word. That chaos can also become present and future cannot alter the fact that it is essentially the past, the possibility negated and rejected by God."[9] The Word of God as spoken from the beginning and repeated again and again is always superior to this chaos. "He will not allow the myth to become a reality...This monstrous world will always show itself to be the possibility which He has originally and finally passed by and excluded."[10] If judgment upon a world alienated from God is indicated as a possibility in this verse it can actually be executed only at one point, in the one creature in whom God Himself is present and is Himself judged. "Gen. 1:2 speaks of the 'old things' which according to 2 Cor. 5:17

---

[9] Ibid., p. 109.

[10] Ibid.

have radically passed away in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. It tells us that even from the standpoint of the first creation, let alone the new, chaos is really 'old things,' the past and superseded essence of this world."[11]

Barth then proceeds to exegete the remaining passages of this first creation narrative in terms of God's decision to create the world by His Word, a fact which is seen in the creation of light, of the day, of living space for man, of the furnishing of the cosmos and finally in the creation of man himself who exists in co-existence, analogous to God's own life. But that which God does not will casts its shadow over the creation in form of darkness and the night, and in the waters which continually threaten to engulf the space which God has permitted for life, thus bearing a visible witness to that which He has rejected.

The thought which Barth develops here is most difficult to follow, especially the notion that chaos has its reality in that which God does not will, a thought which is further developed in volume III, 3. One is here tempted to ask if perhaps Barth has not succumbed to the danger which seems inherent in a system of thought such as his, namely the hypostatisation of language?

---

[11] Ibid., p. 110. Such statements as these lead Wingren to comment that in Barth's thought it is impossible for a struggle to take place objectively between the Creator and creature; Theology in Conflict, op. cit., p. 118. Also Berkouwer; "The question arises whether Barth's view of sin as an ontological impossibility does not jeopardize the reality and the serious consequences of the guilt about which the Bible speaks so emphatically in terms of admonition, threat and judgment, op. cit., p. 232.

It is in this general context that Barth develops his doctrine of freedom. In that evil, sin, chaos, is that which God has eternally rejected, it is not a real possibility for man. Man is not placed, so to speak, at the crossroads, where he is given the power either to follow after God or to follow after evil. This comes out most pronouncedly in Barth's exposition of the prohibition given to man in the Garden which forbade him to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

According to Barth that which is denied man here is just this neutral status, the ability to know good and evil, to distinguish between them and therefore to judge what ought to be and what ought not to be, to distinguish between God's Yes and No, between salvation and perdition, life and death. This decision belongs to the Creator alone and has already been taken. "The Creator distinguishes Himself from the creature by the fact that He exercises this power of distinction; whereas the creature is directed to accept and approve what God who is able and entitled to distinguish has done, does and will do."[12]

In other words man's place is to take knowledge of the divine decision and affirm it and in this his freedom consists. It is in following after God's decision in being obedient that man's freedom and his one possibility lie:

> God's decision for him as taken in and with his creation does not mean that he has not to repeat and affirm it by his own decision. On the contrary, this repetition and affirmation are expected of him, and the capacity and human freedom for it obviously belong to the structure of his peculiar creaturliness. This certainly does not consist in his standing between good and evil and being able to choose between the two. But it does consist in the fact that the man who stands thus before the God who in his creation has determined him for good is not only subject to this divine decision but can respect it in the form of his own decision. This is the freedom which God gave him at his creation. It is in this and no other way that He has determined him in His own decision for good. He expects and has made him capable of confirmation of the obedience of his own free will and act.[13]

Barth reaches the climax of his development of the meaning of freedom when he states that this use of freedom actually does take place at only one spot in human history, the spot where the covenant of God with man is accomplished and fulfilled, that is in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.[14]

---

[12] Ibid., p. 258. One would have to ask here if man's decision not to judge between good and evil, but simply to follow God's judgment and leave the matter of judging in God's hands, does not itself involve a judgment on man's part between good and evil, namely, that it is good for God alone to judge and evil for man to take this judgment into his own hands.

[13] Ibid., p. 265.

Again we are faced with the same complex of problems. Few Christian thinkers would take issue with his positive concept of freedom as taking place in the obedience to God's will, but what does cause one to pause in following Barth here is the way this freedom is ascribed to man as his only possibility, as that decision wherein he must live, regardless of his own affirmation or rejection of the offer to live in this freedom. Even as the event of reconciliation objectively excludes the possibility of this event not reaching man and finding a subjective response in him, so in God's decision as Creator the reality of chaos, of sin and evil is excluded from the life of man and he is determined to follow after God in his own life. Man's only freedom is to accept this decision, to correspond to this decision in his own life, and this acceptance is already a reality for him in that Jesus Christ acting in the place of all men has accepted and confirmed it in fact. If man refuses to correspond to this decision, he is making use of an impossible possibility, denying his own being, even as his refusal to live as one reconciled to God is a denial of his ontological status before God.

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 276.

But when one pursues this line of thought to its logical end, he must ask if this reaching out for that which is impossible can have any validity to it, if this act is to be taken seriously at all, or if it is not merely an act which stems from man's ignorance and is only a sort of pseudo-reality? The weight of Barth's thought would seem to favor this latter interpretation. In that God has from eternity excluded the possibility of a godless world and created it in and by and for the Word, and in that man in Jesus Christ has affirmed this decision with the freedom granted to him, man's failure to correspond in his own life to this reality must be viewed as a sort of macabre side-show which really has no bearing or effect upon that which takes place on the main stage.

This impression is further heightened in Barth's development of this subject in volume III, 3, section 50 - Gott und das Nichtige,[15] in which Barth deals with the traditional problem of the relation between God and the evil that takes place in the world.

Our particular interest is with the peculiar way in which he develops his approach to this subject. The title itself which he gives to this power is instructive as well as the fact that he seeks to understand this reality christologically, that is, in the light of the knowledge of Jesus Christ.

---

[15] Because of the ambiguity of this term it is being left untranslated. Perhaps the best English translation is 'nothingness.'

In Jesus Christ God is present as a creature, but as a lost creature, as a creature threatened and endangered, as One who is attacked by that to which He had never said Yes, by that which He had never declared good. Only in Jesus Christ, in the light of God's grace, do we see the Nichtige as that which opposes God, as that of which we ourselves are the bearers, as that of which we are guilty, but also as that over which He has triumphed and been victorious.

But just what is this force Barth calls the Nichtige? Its being is different from both God's and the creature's. "Was eigentlich und wahrhaft ist, dass kann ja nur Gott und sein Geschöpf sein;"[16] but the Nichtige is neither God nor His creature. Yet one can not say that it is not, for God has it before Him, and thus it is in its own way. It has exactly the essence and the existence which can come to it under the determination given it by God.

This determination given it by God, the ontic connection in which it is real, is the action of God grounded in His Election as Creator and Lord of His creature, as the King of the covenant between Him and man, which, as we have seen, is the goal and meaning of creation. In that God's action is always grounded in Election, it is always a zealous, a burning, a judging action. His being and action always happen in a determined opposition, in real negating, in defense and aggression. Thus the *Nichtige* is that other from which God separates Himself, over against which He affirms Himself and brings to pass His positive will.[17] God wills and in this fact is included the fact that He is unwilling and wills against that which He does not will. "Er sagt Ja und eben damit Nein zu dem, wozu er nicht Ja sagt."[18]

---

[16] K.D. III/3, p. 402.

Barth attempts to clarify this difficult concept in many ways. God is the Lord of the left as well as the right, and thus is the ground and Lord of the *Nichtige*. It is not an accidental element, nor a second God, nor a creature of God, but is only the object of His No and so is problematical, only the impossible possibility, yet it is, in that it is on the left hand of God. It is not simply nothing, but rather the nothingness as such, not without its own, even if evil, rejected Being, which God in the power of His decision thrusts from Himself and leaves behind Himself.[19] It lives because of God's not-willing, having its being as the real correspondence to that which God rejects.

---

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 405.

[18] *Ibid.*

But once it is seen as that which God does not will, its character is also seen, namely as a being evading and contradicting His grace, since that which God wills is His grace. This negation of His grace is the chaos, the eternal past which God rejected.[20] It manifests itself as adverse to grace, robbing God's honor as that which deviates and transgresses.

But since the _Nichtige_ is that which God does not will, the task of its defeat is primarily God's task, His problem. It is the work of His right hand to make the work of His left hand objectless and superfluous. This is in fact God's proper work - to defeat this His alien work, to struggle against it and overcome it - and this is the meaning of His relation to His creature. As Creator He has fulfilled its negation once and for all, and it is exactly when man thinks He is to struggle against it, making it his own concern, that he has fallen to it, for there the creature is seeking to help himself, to be a graceless creature and is thus becoming a bearer of the *Nichtige*.

---

[19] _Ibid_., p. 406.

[20] _Ibid_., pp. 407, 408.

However, the decisive thing that must be said concerning the *Nichtige* when it has been defined and seen for what it is, is that it has no standing. God has made no covenant with it, it has no substance, it is only empty, having the truth of the lie, the power of powerlessness, the meaning of non-meaning. It only exists to allow God's grace really to govern the creature. The goal of God's *opus proprium* is the end of His *opus alienum*.[21] And in Jesus Christ this goal has been reached, for in Him, God has said No to the *Nichtige*, allowing it to break upon Himself in all the wrath and judgment that it possesses as that which God has rejected. In that in Jesus Christ the creature has been raised to the right hand of God, has been established as the creature of God's grace, the *Nichtige* is no longer to be feared, it has no future.[22] Jesus is Victor, this must be proclaimed above all, and if this is so the *Nichtige* is finished, it has no existence and it is just this fact which will be revealed in the final form of the Parousia of Jesus Christ.

Again as in the incipient form in which this thought was developed in volume III, 1, one must ask whether Barth is simply toying around with thought or speaking of something actual.[23] Barth claims that it is exactly at this point where one sees most clearly the brokenness of all theological thought and speech, but it is not this fact which impresses one upon studying this presentation, but rather the opposite, namely the failure to admit the brokenness, the inability of one's thought to understand all that is involved here, and a sophisticated attempt to make this understandable within the general system of his thought.[24]

---

[21] *Ibid*., p. 419.

[22] *Ibid*.

However, for the purposes of this paper, the most important thing is to see the extreme objectivity of Barth's thought on this subject. Evil does not come from the free relationship between God and His creature to which God responds by the resources of His love and grace in order to bring about a restoration of this relationship, but it is a necessary element that is included in the way that God acts, a needed supporting actor, if grace is to be revealed as grace.

Thus though this impossible possibility, this nothingness, intrudes into man's life, it in no way causes a disruption in the relationship between God and man, for it has been met, conquered and stripped of its power from eternity and put in the unwilling role of a servant of God's grace. The man who turns to this impossible possibility is turning to that which is powerless, to an ontological impossibility and he needs to have this error revealed to him and be corrected. But in no way is His relationship with God threatened by this his action.

---

[23] This is the question asked by Gabriel Jones in an excellent review of this section of the Kirchliche Dogmatik in the Scottish Journal of Theology: God and Negation, volume 7, number 3, pp. 233-244.

[24] Berkouwer, op. cit., p. 219. "Barth has established a direct connection between chaos, which in sin receives a concrete form, and God's election which, in his theology, always implies God's rejection."

If one can draw an example - a purposefully simplified and almost absurd example - the Nichtige can be likened to a great ditch dug about a playground and filled with horrible monsters, which a father has constructed in order that his children might see what could have happened to them were they not the children of his love, and also that they might realise the true freedom that is theirs as they willingly play in the limits of the playground. But that which the father did not will for his children has an inescapably enticing appeal about it to the children, and so they edge away from their pleasant environment in which they were happy and free and plunge stupidly into the ditch, only to find that after all the ditch was a mirage, and that all the horrible monsters simply were non-existent. In short the alternative of rejecting their father's love and moving outside the boundaries he had graciously provided for them - which had seemed so real to the children all this time - is now seen as an illusion, for the father had said a final No to that possibility which he himself had originally proposed, and the children like it or not are to live in the playground.

As we have said earlier, this emphasis seeks to avoid a concept of freedom which would present it as a neutral capacity of choice in man, and in this sense Barth is within the Augustinian-Reformed tradition. But the whole problem with this understanding of freedom, especially as it is developed in Barth, is that one can go so far in seeking to avoid this neutral concept of freedom, that the concept itself loses its very meaning and freedom then becomes concerned with a benevolent paternalism in which the right way is chosen for one person by another and all that is left is that this person follow this choice, either willingly or unwillingly, but nevertheless follow. That God could so deal with men, no one will deny, and in view of the misuse which we as men continually make of our freedom, perhaps this way would seem best to us,[25] but the whole dialogical character of the Biblical revelation, which over and over again preserves human response as a genuine choice, as a real decision between two alternatives, would seem to argue against Barth at this point.

The fact that God's objective determination concerning man is that which is all important in God's relationship with man and that man's subjective response to this determination cannot in the least change this relationship is well illustrated in one of the least important sections of Barth's dogmatics, volume III, 3, section 51 - The Heavenly Realm: God's Messengers and Their Opponents. There is no question raised here about the validity of Barth's treatment of this subject, or of the fact that he devotes some 200 pages to a subject which is almost universally regarded as somewhat irrelevant by modern theology. Rather our interest is in the manner in which he sees the relation between angels and devils.

---

[25] Calvin thought this would have been best: "For it would have been unreasonable that God should be confined to this condition, to make man so as to be altogether incapable either of choosing or of committing any sin. It is true that such a nature would have been

Traditionally, when this subject of the relation between angels and devils has been spoken of, it is customary to regard the latter as fallen angels, as angels which denied their place as God's messengers and thus fell from their original place to their present state of opposition to God. The scant Biblical references on this subject would seem to give some support to this view in that there is mention made of fallen angels. (Jude 6, II Peter 2:4.)

Now what is interesting in Barth's treatment of the subject is his emphatic and rigorous rejection of any

---

more excellent; but to expostulate with God as though He had been under any obligation to bestow this upon man, were unreasonable and unjust in the extreme; since it was at his choice to bestow as little as he pleased." Op. cit., I, 15, 8.

such notion as a fallen angel. He, who is so intent on hearing the Biblical witness in its entirety finds these passages too uncertain and too dark. The angelic and demonic realms do not belong together, the devils are not the poor and evil and troublesome relations of angels. Rather, angels and demons are related to one another as creation and chaos, as God's free grace and the _Nichtige_, as redemption and damnation, as kerygma and myth.[26] They exist only as God's turning to includes a turning away, His election a rejection, His grace a judgment. They are the _Nichtige_ in its dynamic aspect, as it is in motion and active.[27]

What is behind all this polemic is certainly not Barth's concern for a correct understanding of the relation between angels and devils, but the implications such a view has for the human sphere. The traditional viewpoint supports a view of freedom which conceives it as no true freedom according to Barth, but only freedom to play the fool, freedom actually to deny one's determination and live one's life in a different sphere. This is what Barth feels he must reject - no real angel does that which a devil does, nor was a devil ever in heaven;[28]

---

[26] _K.D., III/3_, p. 610.

[27] _Ibid_., p. 615.

[28] _Ibid_., p. 623.

for to affirm this could only lead to the assertion that man too could actually use his freedom to resist the will of God and really live apart from God, and thus throw the event of reconciliation into question, making of it a contingent happening which does not take place apart from the actual human response of the individual who is really out of relation to God, or in other words, forcing one to return to a step-wise conception of God's activity in the world.

Chapter VI. BARTH'S VIEW OF MAN IN RELATION TO THE PROBLEM OF THIS STUDY

We turn now to Barth's doctrine of man, developed in volume III, 2. His thought here follows closely the same pattern which we have observed throughout his dogmatics and therefore presents us with the same complex of problems that have emerged throughout our study on the relationship of objectivity and subjectivity in his thought. Thus much of what is said here will appear to be repetitive and perhaps as unnecessary. However, it does seem essential to view Barth's thought on this particular subject which is of such importance in his and any theological system, in order that we may more fully understand the way he conceives the creature who is the recipient of reconciliation. We will concentrate primarily on Barth's understanding of the ontological relationship between christology and anthropology, or more specifically on the actual relationship between Jesus Christ and humanity and then make some passing reference to the material filling out of this relationship in terms of a general anthropology.

This particular volume of Barth's dogmatics is perhaps the most pronounced in its divergence from the dogmatic tradition and there is scarcely a theologian who has studied this work who does not have some grave reservations concerning it.[1] Barth himself states that in this volume he has alienated himself still more from the dogmatic tradition than he did in his doctrine of election. He further states - and this is important in understanding him here - that one who reads this volume must decide if the theological doctrine of man presented here is not only possible, but the only possible approach.[2]

What makes this volume so remarkable is Barth's attempt to derive anthropology completely and solely from christology. The doctrine of man is made dependent on the Word of God. "Wer und was der Mensch ist, das wird uns im Worte Gottes nicht weniger bestimmt und dringlich gesagt wie dieses, wer und was Gott ist."[3]

This is all important! The real man cannot be found except as he is seen in his relationship to the Word of God - Jesus Christ. Here the primary truth about him is disclosed which is more basic and fundamental than anything else about him, including his sinfulness. Here he is seen as God's covenant-partner, a fact against which he can fight and which he can storm, but which he cannot remove.[4] Jesus Christ is the source of our knowledge of the human nature created by God.[5] He is God's relation to sinful man; in Him is seen the decision of God's grace which is prior to and more powerful than any other force man can bring to the fore. "In Gottes Verhalten zu diesem Menschen fällt die Entscheidung, dass Gottes Gnade das Erste, des Menschen Sünde das Zweite, und dass jenes Erste mächtiger ist als dieses Zweite."[6]

---

[1] For example: Brunner, Bouillard, Balthasar, Come, Ebneter, Prenter and Wingren.

[2] K.D., III/2, p. viii.

[3] Ibid., p. 13.

[4] Ibid., p. 38.

This is not to say that the human nature of Jesus Christ is to be directly equated with ours. He differs from us in both His sinlessness and in the fact that His humanity is the humanity of the Son of God. Nevertheless, the truth concerning us as men is found in Him. Jesus Christ takes our human nature which is in contradiction and gives us His, so that "indem Gott um ihn weiss, weiss er in Wahrheit auch um uns."[7] Our humanity is originally hidden in His, this is the great mystery compared to which the perversion of our human nature by sin is only a little mystery. In God's eternal decree, which has as its content the humanity of the Son of God, and in the fulfilment of this decree in time, that is in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the decision falls who and what the true man is.[8]

---

[5] _Ibid_., p. 47.

[6] _Ibid_., p. 48.

[7] _Ibid_., p. 56.

[8] _Ibid_., p. 58.

Thus when we speak of man we must speak of Jesus Christ. The being of man is the history in which one of God's creatures, elected and called by God is perceived in his self-responsibility before Him and in which he proves himself thereto as capable. Jesus Christ does not come under the limitations and definitions of a humanity which is already there apart from Him and conditioning Him, but His being as man is as such the setting and the revelation, the definition of human nature and all its possibilities.[9] What man is, what characterises this creature as man is to be learned from His life-act.

That which Jesus is in His life-act is summarised in the statement that He is the man for God - He is for God.[10] And though there is an unbridgeable gap between Him and us as already mentioned, nevertheless this must be seen as the fundamental truth concerning the anthropological sphere. Man must be seen as opened and marked for God - this is a necessary and constant determination of His nature. In this light the godless man is an impossibility; he is never to be confused with the real man.

All anthropologies which do not begin here, i.e., viewing man's life as a history in which he offers God service, in which he in his own being is for God, are ruled out as invalid, as speaking of phenomenal man, of man as he can be observed on the phenomenal level as distinguished from other creatures, but not man as he is in truth, as man who is actually for God. Thus the various anthropologies of our day - naturalistic, idealistic, existentialist and finally theistic - are weighed and found wanting, as being able at the most to present only symptoms of the real man.

---

[9] Ibid., p. 69.

[10] Ibid., p. 82.

What is especially interesting to the theme of our study is the way in which Barth dismisses what he calls a theistic anthropology. Here he has in mind specifically the approach which Emil Brunner takes in understanding man. To see Barth's opposition here gives us one of the best clues to understanding the basic intent of his anthropology and his theological method as a whole.

Barth commends Brunner for seeking to understand man from the revelation of the Word of God. Here the real man is disclosed, for we see man as one who is created to perceive the Word of God and to be responsible before this Word, becoming a true personality, having a real history and possessing the ability for decision in encounter with this Word. In all this Barth finds himself in agreement with Brunner. But where he strongly disagrees with him is over his viewing of this determination of man as something to which man must respond in order for it to be a reality. For Brunner, man must avail himself of the capacities given him in this determination, or in other words use this freedom given him to be a true man in order for his true being to be a reality, and apart from this right use, this response to God, man is a sinner and lives in alienation from God. "Der Mensch scheint bei Brunner frei, sein Sein und Wesen entweder in der Treue oder in der Untreue gegen Gott zu realisieren, entweder Gott oder auch sich selbst oder den Teufel zu seinem Herrn zu erwählen, seine Geschöpflichkeit und also sein Sein im Worte Gottes entweder zu bestätigen oder auch zu verleugnen."[11]

In Barth's refusal to accept such an understanding of man, we come again to what is central in his thought on the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity in the encounter between God and man. The event of reconciliation is not thrown into uncertainty by the fact that it calls for a response on the part of man; the freedom given man as God's creature is in no sense a freedom to choose or reject God, but only a freedom to follow after God; and so when it comes to an understanding of man, his reality as being in the Word of God, it is in no sense a reality which can be thrown into doubt by what man does in response to this.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 156.

Thus Brunner is rejected because of this neutral understanding of man's being, this understanding of human subjectivity which makes it a necessary factor and a contingent factor in man's relationship with God and thus makes God's determination of man an uncertain thing. "Auch die Liebe und die Erwählung Gottes sind dann für den Menschen insofern noch ein leeres Gegenüber, als sie wohl seine allgemeine Zugehörigkeit zu Gott, aber gerade noch nicht seine positive, der ewigen göttlichen Absicht entsprechende, Beteiligung an Gottes geschichtlichem Handeln zu seinen Gunsten in sich schliessen."[12] So we return again to Barth's alternative solution to this problem - that the objective determination includes in itself man's fulfilment of this determination. For Brunner such a viewpoint is a failure to distinguish between God's determination and its actual fulfilment,[13] but for Barth it is simply a case of realising that God's determination and the actual fulfilment of this determination is an event in Jesus Christ.

Thus when Barth, upon completion of his introductory remarks on anthropology in which he has shown the necessity to ground this sphere in christology, turns to the subject of the real man, the fundamental statement he makes is this: "Die ontologische Bestimmung des Menschen ist darin begründet, dass in der Mitte aller übrigen Menschen Einer der Mensch Jesus ist."[14] This is the archimedean point from which man must be understood.

---

[12] Ibid., p. 157.

[13] Brunner, Emil, The New Barth; Scottish Journal of Theology, Volume 4, 1951, p. 133.

The fact that the man Jesus is in the midst of all other men has as such an ontological meaning, a meaning which stands despite man's decision. A decision has fallen over every man in that He, Jesus Christ, is in their place as the Fellow man; they are all in their time and place changed in that this one Man is.[15] Man has no choice concerning this. "Es ist die Frage: ob und wie er diesen Nachbar kennt und wie er sich zu ihm stellt, so wichtig sie ist, eine sekundäre Frage gegenüber der schon entschiedenen Frage: ob er ohne diesen Nachbarn selber Mensch sein könnte? Diese Frage ist für jeden Menschen ein für allemal negative entschieden."[16]

This ontological determination of man means that he is man in that he is placed in the Person of this One before his divine Partner, a divine Partner who is present completely in this man Jesus. In this Person creaturely essence is addressed by God and it on its part lives for God, and this Person in whom this takes place is the brother, the neighbor of every man. He does not have this relationship with God except in their midst. Thus human being is to be together with this One in whom creaturely being corresponds to its address by divine being.[17]

---

[14] _K.D., III_/2, p. 158.

[15] _Ibid_., p. 159.

[16] _Ibid_.

But if this is the ontological determination of man - to be together with this Man, whose own being is to be together with God - then it cannot be viewed as one determination among others, "sondern seine Grundbestimmung, nicht eine nachträgliche und veränderliche, sondern seine unveränderliche Ursprungsbestimmung: dass es mit Gott zusammen ist."[18] And this means that godlessness is no possibility for man, but rather the ontological impossibility of man's being.[19] Sin happens, but it happens as an ontological impossibility. "Wir sind mit Jesus, wir sind also mit Gott zusammen. Das bedeutet, dass unser Sein die Sünde nicht ein-, sondern ausschliesst. Sein in der Sünde, sein in der Gottlosigkeit, ist ein Sein wider unser Menschensein. Denn der Mensch, der mit Jesus zusammen ist-und eben dies ist des Menschen ontologische Bestimmung - ist mit Gott zusammen."[20]

The development of this general statement emphasises the objectivity of Barth's thought all the more. Man's being together with Jesus means that he is a being who is called forth from God's election and who has his standing in the hearing of God's word.[21] In Jesus Christ we see the gracious will of God for all men - that the Yes He as Creator has spoken to His creature will have its free course, "dass alle Menschen und alle Kreaturen vor dem Argen, nämlich vor dem, wozu Gott als Schöpfer Nein gesagt hat, bewahrt bleiben, vor seiner Bedrohung und aus seiner Gewalt errettet werden."[22] God wills already as Creator, not a threatened and lost but a saved and upheld creature; this is His primary will in that the humanity of Jesus Christ is the content of His election, and because of this, man's being has nothing accidental and secondary and subsequent about it in that it too is part of this divine election. In that in this One man it was decided to preserve man before his taking part in wickedness, it was decided that all creaturely being would stand in the history of the struggle against the enemy, in the history of the victory over this enemy; that it would be the body of the Head in which the triumph of the Creator on behalf of His creature has already been fulfilled.[23]

---

[17] Ibid., p. 161.

[18] Ibid., p. 162.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

---

[21] _Ibid_., p. 170.

[22] _Ibid_., p. 171.

[23] _Ibid_., p. 174.

But man's being, in addition to the fact that it is willed forth from God's electing, also means that he stands as the hearer of God's Word. Here we see in terms of the doctrine of man as creature, what was fully developed in volume IV, 3, namely that God's Word is heard as well as spoken, that man is summoned by it. Jesus Christ declares Himself, that all men are from Him and not without Him, and thus that the being of the real man is to be summoned by the Word of God. History, or more properly primal history, is God's taking the creature to Himself, the Creator becoming creature, or simply the Person of Jesus Christ, and man is a historical being in that he is objectively addressed by this primal history and taken in claim by it. In that God's being is itself a history, this history of the Creator becoming a creature, and in that man is the brother of the man Jesus in whom this history happens, his being too is to be seen as historical, as having a meaning, as taking part and participating in this history.[24] Man's being can be no other than a being in response to the Word of God, a being in the movement in which he is for God in that God is for Him, a being which expresses itself in thanks and in so doing gives the genuine creaturely complement to the grace of God.[25]

---

[24] _Ibid_., p. 193.

[25] _Ibid_., p. 199.

It is in the act of thanks that man has his true subjectivity, corresponding in his own act to that which he is by God's grace. In this act he acknowledges and honors God as the doer of Good. And in this act alone, he distinguishes himself from non-being. "'Sein oder Nichtsein? das ist hier die Frage.', und sie entscheidet sich in der Beantwortung der Frage: Dank oder Undank."[26] It is just this act of thanks - which includes knowledge of God, obedience over against Him, an answering of His call, and a use of his freedom, - which distinguishes him from other creatures. Not that his act of thanks has anything to do with the fact that God is man's Saviour and Preserver, but that in this act of thanks man has freedom to be a subject, to recognise this objective reality and correspond to it in his own act. Thus again freedom is defined in terms of man availing himself of the one possibility open to him - the act in which he corresponds in his subjectivity to the objectivity in which his life is placed. Freedom is not the freedom to sin; sin has no foothold. His freedom in responsibility before God includes in itself that man is preserved before that which is wicked; it means for him, _potest non peccare_ and _non potest peccare_.[27]

---

[26] _Ibid_., p. 204.

[27] _Ibid_., p. 235.

Thus, - and this is most important - in relation to the subjectivity of man outlined above, evil or sin has no place. Even as the objective determination of man as a creature of God, as one of those elected by God along with Jesus means that man is objectively preserved from evil, so his subjective determination - that is the use of his freedom to correspond to this his objective determination - is unaltered and unchanged by anything that man does. Sin hides the real man from us, but does not change his reality. "Das der Mensch in seiner Untat böse ist, das ändert nichts daran, dass auch der Mensch in seiner Geschöpflichkeit und also in seiner Tat (in dem, was seine Tat zu heissen allein verdienen kann) gut ist und bleibt."[28]

Thus we have transposed to another key the same problem with which we were confronted in Barth's doctrine of reconciliation. Man's determination stands under God's determination which is founded in God's electing will and because of this it is unchangeable and unalterable reality. Included in this objective determination is the subjective determination of man, that is, that he live analogously to, or in correspondence with his objective determination, that his *de iure* determination become a *de facto* determination. But here, perhaps even more clearly than in its development in the doctrine of reconciliation, the question of the relation of the objective and the subjective determination of man is posed. Man does not always subjectively correspond to his objective determination - on the phenomenal level there is often no correspondence to the noumenal reality, or at the very best only a partial correspondence on the part of Christians.

---

[28] *Ibid*., p. 236.

Barth's answer to this problem is quite unequivocal. The noumenal reality has become a phenomenal reality in Jesus Christ and in that He is the One who stands for all other men, their phenomenal action detracts nothing from their reality, their sin is a noetic mistake which in no way effects their ontic reality. The fact which cannot be contradicted is that they are men who have their being in and with Jesus Christ in whom both the objective and subjective determination of man have been fulfilled.

The difficulty with this solution - which really stems from the structure of Barth's thought in that he attempts to derive anthropology from christology - merits some discussion, especially as these difficulties are related to our central problem. The fundamental difficulty of this understanding of anthropology can be summarised in the statement that anthropology tends to become confused with soteriology, or that the order of creation tends to be absorbed by the order of reconciliation. As Barth's thought has been developed on God and His relation to the creature in this and the previous section, it has become increasingly apparent to the writer (and probably more so to the reader) that much of the content of volume IV, if not all, is developed here in volume III. In volume IV the melody has been put in another key and perhaps the tempo and rhythm have been changed, but the tune is the same. In fact as we will see shortly in Barth's doctrine of election, the same melody was first played here and all his dogmatics since this time has only been a continual repetition of this one theme.

Thus the question which Brunner asks of Barth in reply to the criticism directed towards him in III, 2 - whether in Barth's thought one is not in virtue of his creation a redeemed man - is quite in order,[29] and the whole critique of Brunner leading up to this question in which he asks Barth whether or not he has simply made the covenants of grace and creation identical also has its validity. Berkouwer too echoes this criticism with a most perceptive comment: "Sin and godlessness do indeed constitute a corruption and denial of grace but they cannot touch the 'being' of man, because man cannot be lost to the covenant of grace."[30]

---

[29] Brunner, op. cit., Scottish Journal, p. 135.

[30] Berkouwer, op. cit., p. 226.

The distinction between creation and reconciliation is thus threatened in Barth's thought, but when this is done the whole meaningfulness in speaking of nature and grace is also threatened. Traditionally in theology, grace and nature have never been absolutely separated in that creation itself, the establishing of nature, has always been seen as an act of God's grace, as an unmerited and undeserved benefit which comes from God's love. But a distinction between this act and God's merciful forgiveness and reconciliation of man who has fallen away from his Creator's intent for him has always been made, and without this distinction it is difficult if not impossible to speak of a relationship between God and man in which a personal encounter takes place and in which there is a real transition from death to life in our historical sphere. As Albert Ebneter states it, grace is grace for a nature which is a nature and not grace, and in the relationship between them, grace does not take up the meaning of nature as nature dissolving it into a mere form of grace.[31] The tendency to do just this in Barth's theology is as Balthasar rightly recognises, one of the unsolved and unclarified problems of his thought. Though he obviously intends to see a distinction and keep the orders of creation and reconciliation from merging into one another, his attempt to see them both as having their reality in the Word become flesh, tends to obscure this distinction completely. "Die Gnadenordnung der Menschenwerdung setzt sich die Schöpfungsordnung voraus, die, von ihr verschieden, doch immer wider zu sehr auf sie reduziert wird."[32]

---

[31] Ebneter, Albert, Der Mensch in der Theologie Karl Barths, Zurich, Orientierung, 1956, p. 36.

This difficulty in Barth's thought is heightened by the fact that he understands man's determination as creature in such a highly objective way, in a manner in which man's subjective decision can only follow and correspond to what is objectively there. In such a structure of thought, the decision of faith comes to have almost no constitutive value in regards to the relationship between God and man. Man is in Christ, in that he is man and to speak of him as the old man, as the man of flesh, or as being under the lordship of evil, as man according to the law who in the decision of faith passes under the Lordship of Christ, is simply an illusion.[33]

Balthasar asks the question of Barth if it is really possible in such a system that a man have not faith? "Wäre ein wirklichen Absprechen des Glauben irgendeinem Menschen nicht gleichbedeutend mit dem Absprechen von Vernungt und Natur?"[34] For on the basis of Barth's thought we are led either to say all men are not real men, or that all men are believers in that the real man is identical with the new man, the man in Christ. In such a situation, the decision of faith is again minimised and seen as that which manifests an already existing relationship, not as being the human response which makes of this relationship a reality.[35] In short, we are brought up again with a sharp reservation about the whole Barthian framework, which sees the subjective included in the objective in such a way that it is both a reality apart from the participation of the existing individual in it in that the existing individual is in Christ objectively, and even in the case of the participation of the existing individual, is at the best a secondary reality in which man exists analogously to that reality of which he is a partaker apart from his response.

---

[32] Balthasar, op. cit., p. 148.

[33] Prenter, Regin, Die Lehre vom Menschen bei Karl Barths, Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel, Freidrich Reinhardt A.G., 1950, p. 221.

---

[34] Balthaser, op. cit., p. 157.

[35] Bouillard, H., op. cit., v. 2, p. 244. "Bref, regardant toujours l'homme du point de vue des intentions divines il tend à minimiser le rôle de la décision humaine. La foi se borne à manifester ce qui existait déjà avant elle." Bouillard as well as most of the Catholic critics of Barth on this point are quite penetrating. Their criticism tends to follow along the same lines of Brunner, i.e., in that Barth refuses to draw a distinction between the divine determination for man and its fulfilment in the subjective response of man, the whole nature of the personal encounter which takes place between God and man is threatened.

It is not the place of this paper to examine Barth's thought on man in detail as he develops it from this foundation, but a very brief summary is in order. The procedure used throughout is constant: he begins by looking at the human nature of Jesus Christ, and then derives from this the truth concerning mankind in general. Thus Jesus as a man lives in correspondence to His determination for life with God in the covenant, by being the man for other men, and in this humanity in general is seen to have its fundamental form as fellow or co-humanity, especially as seen in the encounter between man and woman. Jesus through the gift of the Spirit exists as the whole man, as a subject, as the soul of his body in irresolvable difference, in inseparable unity and in undestroyable order, and because of this man too is seen as an integrated whole, as the soul of his body. Finally, Jesus exists as the Lord of time, as the One in whom time has its fulfilment, as the One in whom past, present and future time have a genuine meaning for us and can be understood as the space for life which God has given to us. In all of these developments the same procedure which we have already outlined is followed. The reality expressed in each section has its ground in christology and is thus the truth concerning man, despite what man himself does on the phenomenal level - a reality which cannot be set aside by man but to which he must correspond with his life.

The artificiality of this whole construction is perhaps the most obvious thing that strikes the reader of these sections. The comment of Bouillard on this approach to anthropology can only be echoed here, namely, that the primacy of Christ does not demand that in order to know man one comprise laboriously in a christological scheme that which one holds in reality from experience and reflection.[36] Certainly Christ is the true Man who reveals the intent of God concerning man, the true man before whom we are all revealed in our sinfulness, but this is not to say that we can have no knowledge of man and his structures apart from Jesus Christ.

Certainly Barth would not maintain that there was no real knowledge of man until the Incarnation, but the alternative to such an absurd conclusion is to make of the event of the Incarnation, a transcendent event, a type of primal reality, out of which every man lives and from which all true knowledge is gained. This in a real sense is what Barth has done. For him the Word become flesh, or Jesus Christ, has taken the place that was given to the eternal Logos by the ancient Greek theologians. In that every man had a certain endowment from the Logos as a creature of God, the fact that pagan philosophy and wisdom was obviously not in total darkness but possessed rays of the true light was given a satisfactory answer, and consequently there was no need to reject the wisdom of the world *in toto*, or to present the revelation in Jesus Christ as totally new and unexpected.

---

[36] Bouillard, op. cit., v. 2, p. 283. Also see Balthasar, op. cit., pp. 253, 4.

Barth rejects the notion of a logos *asarkos*. The Word or the Son, is always to be spoken of as the Word who has taken to Himself human essence, but he still wishes to see the Word as the Greeks saw it, namely as the key to all knowledge, as the foundation of all truth and wisdom. However, since the Word is now understood exclusively as the Word of reconciliation, all creaturely knowledge and wisdom must be derived from the sphere of reconciliation and the independence of human wisdom and of the creaturely order from the order of reconciliation, which was preserved in the ancient Church and which it seems to this writer, must continually be preserved if there is to be any meaningful discourse between the church and the world is threatened and actually dissolved. The result is that on the one hand all truth must now be derived from the Word of reconciliation, so that even the structure of man and the structure of the created order must have a christological foundation,[37] and on the other hand, truth wherever it is found must be viewed as belonging to the Word of reconciliation. The Word of reconciliation is thus the universal Word within which all the orders have their being and determination and thus the distinction between the church and the world, between Christian and secular, is almost completed relativised in that both have their being in the Word of reconciliation, the church knowingly and the world unknowingly.

---

[37] For example, Barth's attempt to see the christological foundation of the state in III, 4. *K.D., III*/4.

Following these general observations on the attempt of Barth to derive the structures of anthropology from christology and the implications of such a method, we conclude this section with a brief glance at one of the particular developments of this thought which has special relevance to the problem of this thesis, namely, Barth's understanding of what is meant when we speak of man as spirit. Here we see focused in a most concrete way the questionableness of Barth's particular approach.

The discussion of this question is raised in section 46 - Man as Soul and Body. Barth of course begins with the christological foundation, developing the thought that Jesus was a whole man - a meaningfully ordered unity of soul and body, the relation of soul and body being analogous to the relation of His essence as Son of God to His creaturely essence, and also of His relationship with the Church.

Because of this man too lives in this ordered unity of soul and body, and that which enables him so to do, as in the man Jesus, is that He has Spirit. "Der Mensch ist, indem er Geist hat."[38] It is the gift of the Spirit that makes man this ordered unity of soul and body and without this gift man would cease to be. But what does it mean to say man has Spirit? It means that at every moment of his life he is grounded, constituted and upheld by God, that God Himself constitutes Him in this unity and maintains him in it. This means more specifically that man is because God is for him.[39] Man is with God, by and of God, and this God is the God of Israel, the God of the covenant. All of this is meant by the statement quoted above, i.e., that man is in that he has Spirit.

Barth distinguishes this position from the more traditional thought which speaks of man as being Spirit. The Spirit has to come to man, it is not essentially his own, so that it is erroneous to say that man is Spirit.[40] The Spirit is God's movement to man and only in this movement is man awakened as the soul of his body, aroused to true subjectivity, placed in his own life movement. Such a concept rests on Barth's understanding of the Holy

---

[38] K.D. III/2, p. 414.

[39] Ibid., p. 419.

[40] Ibid., p. 425.

Spirit. The Holy Spirit in the inner-trinitarian life of God, is the unity of Father and Son, the affirmation of their oneness in distinction. In His being *ad extra*, He is the unity and affirmation of the being of the Father and Son *ad extra* which is in essence, the covenant, and thus of God's binding of Himself to man and man's response to God. It is only as the covenant, which is an event, or history in the true sense of the word, is repeated and affirmed each moment that man has the possibility for life. Thus the Spirit is to be understood not as a something, or as a possession of God or man, but as a deed and relation of the Creator over against His creature.

Such a concept however, tends to blur the independence of man as a creature who truly stands over against God. Once again we are back at the *en* and *an hypostasia* scheme of things wherein, man in a way analogous to the humanity of Christ has his reality only within the divine ruling over him and in relation to which his only choice is to follow in obedience. Although for Barth this in no way limits man's subjectivity, but rather genuinely establishes and guarantees it, such a conclusion can only be made if one accepts the whole structure of his thought. Otherwise this concept of the relationship between God and man seems to be analogous to the relationship between a benevolent despot and his subjects or to that between a mother and new born child in which the umbilical cord remains unsevered.

Arnold Come objects to Barth's thought at this point and to this writer, quite correctly. Part of God's grace in creation is to create man so that in himself he is capable of achieving a unified I, a self, a spirit; and this is the true Image of God in man; and it is this endowment which makes of the relationship between God and man a true relationship between persons. And to go one step further man's potentiality to sin is included in this fact, i.e., that he is created as a true person, for the response that God wills from him is a response that is to be free, and this includes in itself the possibility that man may use his selfhood in a totally different direction, relating himself to some false god or seeking to make of his own life a center about which everything else revolves.[41] Once again we have in Barth's thought the failure to distinguish between creation and reconciliation or more properly his attempt to understand creation only as an event which bears an analogous relation to the primary reality, that of reconciliation.

This conclusion leads to the second criticism which is really a repetition of the first. If man is, only in the fact that God is for Him, only in the fact that God continually supports and maintains his life and continually relates Himself to him, so that man cannot even in his deepest sin fall out of His hand and sphere, and if this God who so holds him by His Spirit is the God of the covenant, the God who has bound humanity to Himself in Jesus Christ, then what is the distinction between the relationship of God to man in general by His Spirit and the relationship between God and the Christian man by His Spirit? Has not natural man become the man in Christ so that again the distinction between the Christian and non-Christian must be framed in noetic terms exclusively? Again, has not creation actually been reduced to reconciliation or to use the terminology of Berkouwer, has not Barth's desire to avoid the step-wise character that one is forced to use if he wishes to draw a meaningful distinction between creation and reconciliation led him to the impasse where God's revelation must be seen as taking place once and for all in a transcendent sphere in which all that is described in this step-wise characterisation of God's acts is seen as happening instantaneously and completely and in relation to which the historical revelation is but the noetic unfolding of this ontic reality which is in itself only one thing?

---

[41] Come, op. cit., p. 102.

Such a criticism leads us quite naturally into a discussion of Barth's doctrine of election, for it is here that this question is really answered. If it were necessary to choose only one volume of Barth's theology to preserve for posterity, volume II, 2 would have to be the volume selected, for here Barth's distinctive and peculiar thought is seen in its sharpest form; here all the questions with which we have been wrestling and struggling are raised in their most acute form, and here the whole course of volumes III and IV are given in advance, so that a perceptive logician could almost deduct the main outlines of these volumes if he were to study this particular volume carefully. Let us then turn to a consideration of Barth's doctrine of election.

Chapter VII. BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN RELATION TO THE PROBLEM OF THIS STUDY.

The role of Barth's doctrine of election in his dogmatics as a whole is not easy to overestimate. In volume I, 2, in a section on the dogmatic method, Barth speaks of the four _Loci_ which procede from the One Word of God, which it is the concern of dogmatics to expound: the doctrine of God Himself, of God's Reconciliation, of God's Creation and of God's Redemption. He is most vigorous in asserting that although these four _Loci_ are really one, dogmatics cannot concern itself with attempting to delineate this unity:

> At the centre, in the Word of God itself as the original point from which they diverge, they are one. But inevitably this point from which they proceed remains invisible. It cannot be the function of either Church proclamation or dogmatics to try to effect this union, or to use its own power of fancy to imitate it. The aim of initiating the unity of dogmatics is one which never has been and never will be accomplished except as one of the four given points throws the other three more or less into the shade, thus doing violence to the real content of the Word of God, not least in the particular point emphasised.[1]

Barth insists that these four points be kept independent from one another, and further affirms that the distinctions involved in such a procedure are real distinctions.[2]

---

[1] _C.D., I/2_, p. 877.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 878.

The question we are faced with in the doctrine of election is whether or not Barth has gone back on his intent and instead seen this doctrine as disclosing this invisible point - the point of unity - and thus whether or not he succeeds in avoiding the pitfall which he himself so clearly recognises, that of doing violence to the three remaining points and even to the doctrine of election itself. In terms of the problem we have been considering, the question is whether the fact that Barth has found the solution to the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity in the doctrine of election, makes its development in both the doctrines of reconciliation and creation seem forced and contrary to the realities which we encounter in these spheres.

This criticism - that Barth's doctrine of election has the tendency to encroach upon and actually to dominate the whole of his dogmatics - is by no means an isolated one, but one which seems to come quite regularly and consistently from those who have studied his thought closely and carefully. Balthasar, for example, comments that the whole question of Barth's theological work really boils down to the question of whether or not his doctrine of Predestination is possible, and he makes the further observation that in this theology of event and history perhaps nothing actually does happen because everything in eternity has already happened.[3] From the

---

[3] Balthasar, op. cit., p. 380.

Protestant side, Brunner makes basically the same criticism, finding in Barth's doctrine of election the tendency to detract from the decisiveness of the historical revelation and thus tear the events of this revelation out of the sphere of history into some pre-temporal sphere.[4]

These criticisms and reservations offered at the beginning of this section are not meant to pre-judge Barth but to indicate some of the problems involved in speaking of his doctrine of election and also some of the controversy that has been raised by this aspect of his thought.

Our particular concern is not to expound this doctrine in all its complexity - this could well be the subject of a separate thesis - but to view it in the light of the question of the relationship of objectivity and subjectivity in God's encounter with man. This particular aspect is treated most fully in section 33 - The Election of Jesus Christ - and in the structural relationship between the contents of this section and the sections which follow - The Election of the community and of the individual. However, a few preliminary remarks on the way Barth goes about conceiving this doctrine are in order in light of the great divergence that takes place here from other more traditional approaches to this subject.

---

[4] Brunner, Emil, The Christian Doctrine of God, Dogmatics: Volume I, trans. by Olive Wyon, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1950, p. 347.

The doctrine of election is placed by Barth within the Doctrine of God, and is viewed as that which primarily describes God in His being, which is itself a history, as it is directed *ad extra*. It is the description of that event in which God ceases to be God for Himself and relates Himself to another in such a way that He can no longer be known as God except in this relationship with the other.[5]

This movement *ad extra* in which God freely determines to live His life is however, a definite movement, whose content is specifically defined. God's movement *ad extra* is the founding of the covenant, or more specifically, Jesus Christ. The original decision of God is to be God only in union with this man and through Him with all men. This is the primal history (Urgeschichte) for whose purpose world history (Weltgeschichte) takes place.

> The primal history which underlies and is the goal of the whole history of His relationship *ad extra*, with the creation and man in general is the history of this covenant. The primal history, and with it the covenant, are, then, the attitude and relation in which by virtue of the decision of His free love God wills to be and is God. And this relation cannot be separated from the Christian conception of God as such. The two must go

---

[5] *C.D., II/2*, p. 6.

> together if this conception is to be truly Christian. For that reason, this relation must form the subject of a second part of our doctrine of God.[6]

Thus the truth of election is the sum of the Gospel, the whole of the Gospel, for it proclaims that God meets the world not in indifference or in enmity, but that from eternity "He is for this man Jesus, and in Him for the whole race, and therefore for the whole world."[7] God's action from the beginning is gracious, it is a Yes, and since this is primary, the opposition of sin which arises afterwards cannot annul or cancel it out.

Thus it is most important to see the origin of this doctrine in Jesus Christ, for that which He is and does in time, that which is the content of christology and soteriology, is the content of God's eternal will, the fulfilment on earth of that decree which is already fulfilled in heaven. When we see Jesus Christ we have to do with the electing God and at the same time with the elected man, who has united with Him and who represents an elect people. "It is the name of Jesus Christ which, according to the divine self-revelation, forms the focus at which the two decisive beams of the truth forced upon us converge and unite: on the one hand the electing God and on the other elected man."[8]

---

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 9.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

In this conception, the center of God's work, the covenant, or the one event of reconciliation, is also seen as the beginning and end of His work. The doctrine of election is the mystery of the doctrine of reconciliation and must be seen as at the beginning - as before the beginning - or what must subsequently be said of God's dealings with His creation.[9] Otherwise creation and sin can be thought of independently of reconciliation; sin being seen as something which makes creation problematical in answer to which reconciliation is God's method of escaping the dilemma posed to Him, a much too anthropomorphic and dualistic way of viewing things. "That God elects man, that He determines man for Himself, having first determined Himself for man, is not one moment with others in the prophetic and apostolic testimony. Enclosed within the testimony to God Himself, it is the moment which is the substance and basis of all other moments in that testimony."[10] This movement of God to man is an eternal movement, enclosing man in his finitude and temporality and cannot be overriden or altered by another decision.[11] In the beginning God is gracious and what

---

[8] _Ibid_., p. 59.

[9] _Ibid_., p. 89.

[10] _Ibid_., p. 91.

[11] _Ibid_.

He does as Creator, Reconciler and Redeemer are the ways and works of His grace. The doctrine of election thus bears witness to the fact that grace is the starting point for all reflection and utterance of any statement concerning God's works and ways.[12]

With this introduction to the outlines of Barth's thought on this subject and its importance and place in dogmatics we turn to the most important section of his work for this study - The Election of Jesus Christ. The content of this section is an elaboration of a point made in the introduction - Jesus Christ is both the electing God and the elected man.

In the Person of Jesus Christ God stands before man and man before God, and out of this primal reality and for it, creation and all God's dealings with the creature take place. God's Word is God's binding of Himself to this man and this man's response to this act of condescension. It is this Word, Jesus Christ, about whom the prologue of John 1:1,2 speaks.[13] God from all eternity has determined Himself the bearer of the name Jesus Christ, the bearer of humanity.

---

[12] *Ibid*., p. 93.

[13] *Ibid*., pp. 95-99.

> In the beginning, before time and space as we know them, before creation, before there was any reality distinct from God which could be the object of the love of God or the setting for His acts of freedom, God anticipated and determined within Himself (in the power of His love and freedom, of His knowing and willing) that the goal and meaning of all His dealings with the as yet non-existent universe should be the fact that in His Son He would be gracious towards man, uniting Himself with him. In the beginning it was the choice of the Father Himself to establish this covenant with man by giving up His Son for him, that He Himself might become man in the fulfilment of His grace. In the beginning it was the choice of the Son to be obedient to grace, and therefore to offer up Himself and to become man in order that this covenant might be made a reality. In the beginning it was the resolve of the Holy Spirit that the unity of God, of Father and Son should not be disturbed or rent by this covenant with man, but that it should be made the more glorious, the deity of God, the divinity of His love and freedom, being confirmed and demonstrated by this offering of the Father and this self-offering of the Son. This choice was in the beginning. As the subject and object of this choice, Jesus Christ was at the beginning. He was not at the beginning of God, for God has indeed no beginning. But He was at the beginning of all things, at the beginning of God's dealings with the reality which is distinct from Himself. Jesus Christ was the choice or election of God in respect of this reality. He was the election of God's grace as directed towards man. He was the election of God's covenant with man.[14]

Thus along with the Father and Holy Spirit Jesus Christ is the electing God. He is Himself primarily and properly the divine freedom itself in its operation *ad extra*. He is not merely the Reconciler between God and man; first, He is Himself the reconciliation between them.[15]

---

[14] *Ibid*., pp. 101, 102.

[15] *Ibid*., pp. 104, 105.

In electing to become man, in His act of obedience to His Father, election takes place. This obedience whose content is God's humanity, is God's primary decision.

However, Jesus Christ is also the elected man. This is not meant in the traditional sense that in His humanity He was one of the elect, but that He is the Elect of God. Thus:

> before all created reality, before all being and becoming in time, before time itself, in the pretemporal eternity of God, the eternal divine decision as such has as its object and content the existence of this one created being, the man Jesus of Nazareth, and the work of this man in His life and death, His humiliation and exaltation, His obedience and merit. It tells us further that in and with the existence of this man the eternal divine decision has as its object and content the execution of the divine covenant with man, the salvation of all men.[16]

Because Jesus Christ is the electing God as well as the elected Man, the election of all men takes place in Him. "His election is the original and all-inclusive election, the election which is universally meaningful and efficacious, because it is the election of Him who Himself elects."[17] Thus we find here the thought that was continually repeated in the doctrine of reconciliation - that it is the divinity of Jesus Christ and this alone which gives His activity on our behalf its saving significance.

---

[16] Ibid., p. 116.

[17] Ibid., p. 117.

In developing his thought on the election of Jesus Christ Barth makes the statement that Jesus Christ was elected to suffer and die, a development which sheds light on his doctrine of sin. In that God's free grace is turned towards the creature, rejection, death is involved as well as election. It is to the death on the Cross that the Son of God elects Himself when He before all time humbles Himself to become man. Here Barth's thought is most difficult.

> The election of the man Jesus means, then, that a wrath is kindled, a sentence pronounced and finally executed, a rejection actualised. It has been determined thus from all eternity. From all eternity judgment has been foreseen - even in the overflowing of God's inner glory, even in the ineffable condescension of God's embracing of the creature, even in the fulness of self-giving by which God Himself wills to become a creature. For teleologically the election of the man Jesus carries within itself the election of a creation which is good according to the positive will of God and of man as fashioned after the divine image and foreordained to the divine likeness (reflection). But this involves necessarily the rejection of Satan, the rebel angel who is the very sum and substance of the possibility which is not chosen by God (and which exists only in virtue of this negation); the very essence of the creature in its misunderstanding and misuse of its creation and destiny and in its desire to be as God, to be itself a god.[18]

In the election of the man Jesus and all creation in Him, the shadow world, the Nichtige is posited, the possibility is opened that the creation will not live by grace - by its election in Jesus Christ - that man will be a graceless creature. And this is a possibility which man cannot resist in himself. Thus man in himself incurs the rejection of God, he stands under His wrath; but he is the very man loved by God from all eternity in and with the election of the man Jesus. Thus from all eternity an exchange takes place.

---

[18] *Ibid*., p. 122.

> The rejection which all men incurred, the wrath of God under which all men lie, the death which all men must die, God in His love for men transfers from all eternity to Him in whom He loves and elects them, and whom He elects at their head and in their place. God from all eternity ordains this obedient One in order that He might bear the suffering which the disobedient have deserved and which for the sake of God's righteousness must necessarily be borne. Indeed, the very obedience which was exacted of Him and attained by Him was His willingness to take upon Himself the divine rejection of all others and to suffer that which they ought to have suffered.[19]

Thus Jesus is the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world, the crucified Jesus is the image of the invisible God; the Judge takes the place of the judged, and the judgment has no longer any relevance for those who ought to be judged. Here we have the foundation of Barth's rigorous teaching on substitution, elaborated in the doctrine of reconciliation.

But the rejection which Jesus suffers does not in any sense override His election. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is the answer of the divine faithfulness to His rejection, as His prayer of assent to the will of God is the answer of human steadfastness in which He proves He is still the Elect, both together glorifying God and bringing about the salvation of man. His rejection cannot cancel out His election.

---

[19] *Ibid*., p. 123.

In the context of this exposition Barth enters into a long excursus on the Supralapsarian-Infralapsarian controversy within Reformed orthodoxy in the 17th century. While seeing the deficiencies of both positions as formulated, Barth is sympathetic with the intent of the Supralapsarians and speaks of the possibility of a purified Supralapsarian position that would avoid the errors of the original formulation.

In such a structure God's primary purpose in relation to the world would be His will to impart and reveal Himself and with Himself, His glory. But this purpose would be seen concretely as His willing of the elected man, predestined as the witness to His glory and the object of His love. This man would be elected to reveal, confirm and verify both positively what God is and wills and negatively what He is not and does not will, the No which forms a necessary boundary to God's Yes. It is thus God's will that sin should be repudiated and rejected and excluded by man even as God does in His life-act. And so man is foreordained as sinful man, man as laden with sin and afflicted by their curse and misery and in this situation, where man says no to them and repudiates them, their defeat takes place, namely the event of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

> In willing man, His man, elected man, God wills that this should be the case. He wills the confrontation of man by the power of evil. He wills man as the one assailed by this power. He wills him as the one who, as man and not God, has not evolved this power of himself but is subjected to it. He wills Himself as the One who must and will come to the help of man in this subjection, who alone in this subjection can and will give to man the victory...God wills _homo labilis_, not in order that he may fall, but in order that when he has fallen he may testify to the fulness of God's glory. And His willing and election of _homo labilis_, not for the fall, but for uplifting and restitution by an act of divine power; the demonstration in time, in the creaturely sphere, of His eternal self-differentiation: this foreordination of elected man is God's eternal election of grace, the content of all the blessings which from all eternity and before the work of creation was ever begun God intended and determined in all creation. The existence of this man, the predestined bearer and representative of the divine Yes and the divine No, foreordained to victory over sin and death but also to the bearing of the divine penalty, is the divine promise, the divine Word, in which the God who elects from all eternity confronts all humanity and each individual, in which His electing will encounters us and through which He Himself has dealings with us.[20]

Thus the God of this purified Supralapsarian view is a God of love who gives man a share in the divine Yes and for the sake of the Yes, in the divine No. He is the God who places man in this antithesis and Himself overcomes it.[21] In that the Elect Man in whom God's rejection is overcome stands at the beginning of all God's works and ways, there can be no question of God abandoning the creation, or of evil actually being a power in the world. "In the Elect He revealed evil only as a power already vanquished, a kingdom of darkness already destroyed."[22] Nor can there be any question of a moral levity, for evil is willed by God but only in the just and holy non-willing, "to which His Elect is created and summoned to certify and which human history occurs in order to fulfil, in correspondence with eternal self-determination by which God is God and not _not_ God."[23] In short a Supralapsarianism which concentrates on Jesus Christ expresses the truth of the Gospel.

---

[20] _Ibid_., pp. 141, 142.

[21] _Ibid_., p. 142.

We are thus confronted with the peculiar structure of Barthian thought once again and this time at its most crucial point of development. The question that must be asked of this formulation is this - can the content of God's revelation in history which follows the pattern, creation, sin, reconciliation, be telescoped together into one eternal moment in which reconciliation is seen as the content of this moment and creation and sin are viewed as the unfolding in time and space of that which is involved in this one act of reconciliation, i.e. that the object of election has a true standing by His election, seen in the establishing of the creature and that this being who is elected by God at the same time bears God's rejection and wrath but in such a way that this rejection is overcome, as seen in the fall of man into sin?

---

[22] _Ibid_.

[23] _Ibid_., pp. 142, 3.

Important here is the exegetical question, for Barth can and does cite passages which refer to Jesus Christ and even to the crucified and risen Jesus Christ as being the eternal purpose of God. However, one must ask if Barth's way of understanding these passages is the only way possible. Actually as the authors of the New Testament reflected on the experience of reconciliation which was theirs in their relationship to Jesus Christ they spoke of this experience in the most exalted terms. They saw this their relationship to God, this their sonship, the fact that they were now at peace with God and freed for His love and service - all that which had been brought about in their relationship with the crucified and risen Jesus Christ - as the fulfilment of God's original purpose for His creation, as the teleological goal of God's revelation. They proclaimed that all the resources of God's love and grace had been directed to this end; that this was God's purpose for creating the world and that God had never turned from His purpose in spite of man's sin, but had been at work even in man's rejection of Him, even in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, to bring men into relationship with Him.

This is not offered as a developed alternative to Barth's exegesis, but simply to indicate that other approaches to these verses and passages are possible and that one can speak of Jesus Christ and the reconciliation that takes place in His relationship with sinful men, as the fulfilment of God's eternal purpose, without reducing the historical revelation to the unfolding in time and space of that which is the content of eternity, of primal history, and ultimately of the being of God.

If one accepts Barth's position then one must say that the event of the Incarnation described in John 1:14 by the phrase, "the Word became flesh," should be understood to mean, "Jesus Christ became flesh." In other words the decisive thing in God's relationship with man, in His encounter with man, is not the historical Incarnation, not the fact that the Son or the Word of God - God in His being as Revealer - actually at a point in time took human flesh to Himself and dwelt among men in order to reconcile them to God. Rather the decisive thing is the eternal reconciliation that takes place in the life of God Himself as He turns _ad extra_, the fact that from eternity God has made Himself the being of this other and thus upheld and maintained this other; and that which takes place in history is the disclosure of this eternal act, first in terms of creation, in which it is seen that God has granted the object of His election its own being, then in terms of sin, in which it is disclosed what possibility God has rejected in calling into being this other, i.e., the possibility that this being would be something other than a being enhypostatic in the being of God, and finally in the historical Incarnation in which the eternal reconciliation is repeated in time, and that which God truly elects for man is revealed to him.

Such a conception to say the least would seem to detract from the seriousness of human decision and faith, a fact which will become clear when we see the relation of the election of Christ to the community and the individual. The decisive thing has taken place in eternity, in the realm of Urgeschichte. Here is where the decision concerning man has been made. Man is called upon to follow this decision, to exist analogously to the reality of his election, but his decision is not constituitive of the reality of his being in Christ.

Also the whole concept of sin tends to be blurred here and viewed as purely secondary to the fundamental gulf which separates God and man. Wingren has a valid point when he speaks of Barth's theology as posing a fundamental antithesis between God and man, for God's rejection and wrath seem to be closely connected to the fact that man is a creature, that he is something other than God and in this otherness poses a threat to God.[24] "The very fact that man was not God but a creature, even though he was a good creature, had meant already a certain jeopardising of the honour of God as whose instrument man had been created."[25] In his sinfulness the creature illumines this risk which God takes, revealing the jeopardy in which God placed Himself - his unreliability as a creature is demonstrated by his disloyalty as a sinful creature[26] - but it is just this sinful creature which God has made His covenant-partner, this man who drove God to the Cross is the one chosen by God to fellowship in the election of Jesus Christ, whose rejection He takes on Himself in order that man might not be rejected.

This is a most difficult concept to grasp. This difficulty seems to reside in the fact that sin which the Biblical revelation regards as man's contingent reaction to God's twofold grace as Creator and Reconciler, is made part of an eternal happening in which it loses its obvious meaning altogether, on account of which distinctions must be drawn between God's willing and non-willing which tend to have the appearance of semantic nonsense.

---

[24] This is the thrust of an article: Gott und Mensch bei Karl Barth, where he stresses that for Barth the danger for God in election is primarily that of taking the creaturely situation to Himself rather than the sinful situation., in Luthertum, Heft 2, Berlin, Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1951.

[25] C.D., II/2, p. 163.

[26] Ibid., p. 166.

Another problem that arises from this attempt to see Jesus as the content of God's electing decree stems from the concept of Jesus Christ as the Elect Man. God's Yes, for which His No is also uttered, is addressed to this man; He from all eternity is the recipient of God's grace, the object of God's election. He is the One who honors it in His life giving the human response willed by God, and in this receiving and attesting of grace our election also is included. Christ is the only rejected man and in that His election has overcome this rejection, our place with Him as the Elect is assured. He is our Representative and the fact that Adam fell, or David sinned, or Peter denied, or Judas betrayed cannot be balanced against His resurrection in which His election was affirmed by God. These facts of human sin are true, "but it is also true that they are far outweighed by the resurrection of Jesus Christ and that as the result of this resurrection they belong already to the vanished past."[27]

Thus we come to the fount from which Barth's particular view of the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity springs. Jesus Christ as the object of election, as the elect Man, acts in the place of man and is the objective truth concerning man. In that He receives God's grace and attests it in His life as the elect Man, our subjective response to God has been made, and with it our election takes place. It is the reality which is true of us, a reality which includes its shining forth and leading us to an action in which we correspond to what we are in Him.

---

[27] Ibid., p. 174.

This is the point that is developed at great length in the sections on the election of the community and the individual. The election of grace which is the election of Jesus Christ, is at the same time, the election of the community which is to attest Jesus Christ, and through the community is also the election of individual men. "Included in His election there is therefore, this 'other' election, the election of the many (from whom none is excluded) whom the electing God meets on this way."[28] Between Jesus Christ and these others, however, stands the community (Gemeinde) for men as a fellowship are elected in Jesus Christ and determined for a particular service.

By the community Barth means both Israel and the Church, for together they provisionally form the natural and historical environment of the man Jesus Christ. Because the community is His body it bears witness to the double predestination that takes place in Him, to the rejection and election which together makes up the reality of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the crucified Messiah of Israel, being the authentic witness of the judgment God takes on Himself by choosing fellowship with man, and He is the risen Lord of the Church, the authentic witness to the mercy in which God, in choosing man for fellowship with Himself, turns toward him His own glory, and He is both together, not the one without the other.[29]

---

[28] Ibid., p. 195

The community thus moves between two poles, the human turning away from the electing God and the turning of the electing God towards man. There is a difference between these two forms, but also indissoluble unity.

> Behind and above the human obduracy characteristic of the Israelite form of the community there stands indeed the divine rejection, but there stands also God's election in which He has determined Himself to take upon Himself the rejection. And behind and above the divine calling characteristic of the Church form of the community there stands indeed the divine election, but for this same reason there stands also the rejection that God Himself has taken upon Him.[30]

Thus the community in its two-fold form bears witness to the judgment and mercy of God.- Israel reflecting the judgment from which God has rescued men and wills to endure Himself, indicating what God elects for Himself when He elects fellowship with man, while the Church reflects the mercy in which God turns His glory to man, the primal basic decision of God, i.e., that His judgment, His rejection is for the purpose of His election. On its part, Israel must serve even though this service is offered unwillingly, and in that it attests Jesus Christ it also has part in His election.

---

[29] Ibid., p. 198.

[30] Ibid., p. 200.

> By their resistence to their election they cannot create any fact that finally turns the scale against their own election, separating them from the love of God in Jesus Christ, cancelling the eternal decree of God... They can do nothing to hinder the application and objective validity even for themselves of the testimony of God's mercy in Jesus Christ. They can do nothing to alter the fact that Jesus Christ, delivered up by them, is crucified for their sakes too... They cannot deny that Jesus of Nazareth is - primarily and supremely - theirs.[31]

This same basic pattern is followed throughout this section. Thus the one community is determined for the hearing in its Israelite form and for the believing of the promise of God in its churchly form, again as a reflection of that which takes place in the election of Jesus Christ. Finally, in Jesus Christ God has appointed for man a gracious end and a gracious beginning, making him die in order that he may truly live and the community in its form as His earthly historical existence corresponds to Him in a passing (Israelite) and a coming (Church) form.[32] Israel attests that the old man is the man set aside by God disclosing what God elects for fellowship with Himself in electing man, while the church lays hold of the divine mercy, proclaiming the exaltation of Jesus as the goal of His humiliation.

---

[31] *Ibid*., pp. 209, 210.

An almost identical pattern is followed by Barth when he comes to speak of the individual. The community witnesses to every man that his choice of godlessness is void, that he from eternity belongs to Jesus Christ, that he is elected in Him, and that his rejection has been taken up and borne by Him. The man who receives his election bears witness to it to the world whereas the man who rejects it also bears witness of that which God has rejected in Jesus Christ, and thus together both serve Jesus Christ in their witness.

Barth begins this section with an attempt to show how the election of Jesus Christ includes the election of individual men:

> That which has been eternally determined in Jesus Christ is concretely determined for every individual man to the extent that in the form of the witness of Israel and of the Church it is also addressed to him and applies to him and comes to him, to the extent that in His Word the electing God enters with him into the relationship of Elector to elected, and by His Word makes him an elected man.[33]

---

[32] Ibid., p. 260.

[33] Ibid., pp. 309, 310.

The election of man is at issue in the election of Jesus Christ and though it applies to Him properly He is all that He is for them and gives them all things in and with His election.[34]

This is developed in the most objective way. The possibility of being a rejected man has been taken from the sphere of human possibilities by the fact that Jesus Christ has borne this rejection away. In and with the election of Jesus Christ man is elect, he is in Christ, and though he may fight against this reality he cannot put it in jeopardy.

> In defiance of God and to his own destruction he may indeed behave and conduct himself as isolated man, and therefore as the man who is rejected by God. He may represent this man. But he has no right to *be* this man, for in Jesus Christ God has ascribed this to Himself with all that it involves and therefore taken it away from man. What man can do with his negative act can only be the admittedly real and evil and fatal recollection and reproduction of that which has been removed from him; but for all its wickedness and disastrous results this negative act as such can never be other than impotent. Man can do it and persist in it. He can become a sinner and place himself within the shadow of divine judgment which his powerless representation of the man rejected by God is unable to escape. He does all this. But he cannot reverse or change the eternal decision of God - by which He regards, considers and wills man, not in his isolation over against Him, but in His Son Jesus.[35]

The community and the individuals within it know the secret about mankind in general, namely their election in Christ. To use an example, the community can be likened to an adult who knows of the law of gravity and the world to children who are unaware of this law. Because of their ignorance they are attempting to jump from a porch and fly. The knowing adult sees this foolishness and tells them of that which they are ignorant and thus of the futility of their venture. Some children will hear and cease their vain attempt, others will continue but all will nonetheless be bound to this law, for this law is not something dependent on their response to it, it does not become a reality when they are awakened to it and accept it, but operates inexorably and unalterably apart from any response.

---

[34] *Ibid*., p. 310.

[35] *Ibid*., pp. 316, 317.

This is the nature of man's election. It is a reality in Jesus Christ, in fact it is the eternal reality out of which man is created. When man lives as a rejected man he does indeed enter into conflict with his election:

> but it cannot annul it, because it is not to be sought or found in him, but is grounded in Jesus Christ... The community recognises and attests the being of man - every man - in Jesus Christ. It recognises and attests, therefore, in regard to every man the threat of his rejection, the promise of his election: the threat which is rendered powerless by Jesus Christ; the promise which is empowered by Jesus Christ.[36]

---

[36] *Ibid*., p. 321.

Of course it is important that man lives in correspondence to his being, that subjectively there take place in his life that which is objectively valid concerning him, that man wills what God wills, namely his election in Christ. But this subjective response is not in itself a constitutive element of man's election, rather it stems from his being elect in Christ.

Thus on the human level there are elect men and rejected men. The elect men are opened by the Holy Spirit to know their election and to proclaim this election which is the reality of others too. The rejected man lacks this; He lives in contradiction to his election, he conjures up again the shadow of the aversion and hate of God which menaces every man and which God has taken to Himself. Yet his life as a rejected man is futile, he cannot alter the fact that there is only one rejected man and that is Jesus Christ.[37] And in that Jesus Christ is this rejected man, He is also Lord of the rejected as well as the elect, and their lives testify to Him, to that which God does not will, doing this no less indispensibly in their own place, as the elect in theirs. Because of this, that which binds the elect and rejected together is far greater than that which separates them. The distinction of the elect which is originally and properly that of Jesus Christ alone, is also valid for the rejected. "They cannot prevent God from regarding them as from all eternity He has willed to regard and has actually regarded sinful men in His own Son."[38]

---

[37] *Ibid*., p. 346.

This relation of elect and rejected is worked out almost in terms of a mathematical formula by Barth. In that at the point of primal reality, at the point of universal significance, the point that could be expressed mathematically by the symbol of infinity, the Elect and the Rejected are one, therefore any other number which is combined with either side will also be equal. In that they are both related to infinity, the difference between them is neutralised.

> There are, in fact, these two classes of men, the called and the uncalled, the believing and the godless, and therefore the elect and apparently rejected, the community of God and the world. According to the testimony of the Scriptures, both these lines are followed in human history, both as a whole and in detail. It is the history of the continually renewed consolidation, separation and encounter of these two peoples. But we must also observe that according to the same testimony of the Scriptures, the peculiar and primary history of these two peoples, and the peculiar and primary contrast between them, is not to be sought and recognised where the two peoples face one another as such, the 'elect' and the 'rejected.' That which separates one from the other, and connects them both, is properly and primarily realised and revealed, not in the peoples, but where the elect and the rejected face one another in one and the same

---

[38] *Ibid*., p. 349.

> person - against one another, yet also for one another.[39]

In this framework of thought, both elect and rejected have their determination in a similar way to the twofold determination of the community. The determination of the elect involves his life in the community in which he allows himself to be loved by God, living as one who from all eternity was not rejected but elected. Moreover, in his life there will be a correspondence to the glory of God Himself and its work - the fact that God is for him and for all men will be reflected in his life. He will be a witness, an apostle, attesting, representing that which God really is and does in Jesus Christ, and in so doing election itself will actually be taking place, for part of its one reality is that this subjective correspondence and attestation take place.

The rejected for their part will attest that which God does not will. The rejected accompanies the elect having no independent existence apart from him, even as the rejection of Jesus Christ has its reality in His election. Nevertheless alongside of the elect the rejected man testifies to the elect about the man to whom the Gospel is addressed, of the one who is the recipient of election. He manifests what is denied and overcome in the Gospel thus insuring such terms as 'communion with

---

[39] Ibid., p. 351.

God,' 'forgiveness of sin,' 'the resurrection and life everlasting,' are never empty words. Finally, he manifests the purpose of the Gospel in that he has no future and is marked for passing over to the elect.

The meaning of the rejected is seen as focused and revealed in Judas Iscariot, one who was in the closest conceivable proximity to Jesus Christ Himself. Though his person was liquidated and he is called the son of perdition, yet one cannot say the redemptive significance of Jesus had no meaning for him. Does this mean _apokatastasis_ - the universal salvation of all? Not exactly is Barth's answer, but neither is this possibility to be excluded:

> The Church will not then preach an _apokatastasis_, nor will it preach a powerless grace of Jesus Christ or a wickedness of men which is too powerful for it. But without any weakening of the contrast, and also without any arbitrary dualism, it will preach the overwhelming power of grace and the weakness of human wickedness in face of it.[40]

In this brief review of Barth's doctrine of election we can see the origin of the complex of problems that have accompanied us from the outset of our study. It is here that the concept of the _totus Christus_ first comes to clear expression. The being of Jesus Christ, He who is electing God and elected man in one Person, includes in Himself the being of the community and of all men. 'To be' is to be elect in Jesus Christ, or to put it in terms of the relationship of objectivity and subjectivity, the one objective event, namely God's election of grace, includes in itself the subjective response to this grace in the elected man Jesus, a response which is also valid for every man apart from their subjective participation in it, but at the same time includes within it this very participation.

---

[40] _Ibid_., p. 477.

But the problems that accompany such a conception of the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity also come to the fore here. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Barth's treatment of the question of *apokatastasis*. Just as we were forced to ask in our study of his doctrine of reconciliation how seriously the *de facto* participation in reconciliation could be taken in light of its *de iure* validity, and just as in the doctrine of man we were led to ask how important man's correspondence to his being together with the man Jesus could be in the light of the fact that this being in an ontological reality apart from any response to it, so here we must ask how important is it that a man correspond to the reality of his being elect in Christ?

Barth equivocates on this point. There are places where he seems to indicate the necessity of man's correspondence to his election in order that this election become reality,[41] and in his treatment of the relation between Judas and Jesus he is unwilling to resolve the tension between Jesus for Judas and Judas against Jesus, speaking rather of the open situation of proclamation.[42]

On the other hand the whole sweep of his thought and the whole intent of his presentation would seem to lead to a clear expression of the doctrine of apokatastasis, and one can only ask if Barth is really serious about what he says concerning the elected man Jesus and our election in Him as the beginning of all the ways and works of God, as the primal reality from which all other reality derives, how he can deny this final conclusion. To do so seems to throw the whole objectivity of the Word of God - which it has been his intent and purpose to develop and maintain - into jeopardy and reopens the distinction between possibility and actuality which he has sought so rigorously to deny.

To talk about the brokenness of theological thought or the right to be logically inconsistent if the Biblical revelation so demands, hardly seems relevant at this point. The point is whether Barth actually means what he says when he speaks about Jesus Christ as the only rejected man or of our election being included in His. The suggestion of Brunner, that perhaps Barth withdraws from asserting the doctrine of *apokatastasis* because its affirmation would put him in dubious theological company is not to be taken too seriously.[43] However, both Balthasar and Berkouwer cannot be denied when they assert that for Barth to deny the *apokatastasis* is in effect to draw back from the clear and unmistakable implications of his thought and in effect to throw his whole system which has aimed at objectivity into question.[44]

---

[41] See for example, Ibid., pp. 126, 127.

[42] Ibid., p. 476.

It is interesting to note that in this connection Barth seems to be moving closer to a doctrine of *apokatastasis* as his thought develops. Thus in the essay *The Humanity of God*, he draws as one of the implications of God's humanity the fact that we cannot open up again the abyss closed in Jesus Christ. God's humanity is the affirmation of man.[45] The human spirit must be seen as naturally Christian, the humanism of God as more fundamental than the godlessness of man's humanism.[46] Again he refuses to draw a doctrine of universalism from these thoughts, but he warns against panicking over such a thought and advises that one seriously consider the possible good meaning of such a thought, concluding that the eternally skeptical critical theologians who are gloomy on this point are as much a danger as the unbecomingly cheerful indifferentism or even antinomianism which one with a certain understanding of universalism could develop. Thus although Barth maintains in theory a position of neutrality on this point, it is quite obvious where his sympathies lie.

---

[43] Brunner, *Dogmatics*, vol. 1, p. 348.

[44] Balthasar comments on Barth's forbidding the thought of *apokatastasis*: "Dennoch ist diese Vorstellung in der Erwählungslehren Barths nicht nur eine möglich, sondern eine unvermeidlich notwendige, die allem übrigen zum tragenden Grund und zur Voraussetzund dient." *op. cit.*, p. 199. Berkouwer is equally emphatic: "In view of Barth's emphasis on the factuality of Christ's rejection, it is not possible to close the door to the *apokatastasis* doctrine by pointing to the fact that the Bible speaks of rejection as well as election and then entrust everything eschatologically to the hand of God." *op.cit.*, p. 115. He goes on to point out that while the doctrine of *apokatastasis* is an invalid human conception independent of revelation, yet according to Barth's thought it would be part of the eternal decree of God revealed in His Word. He concludes: "There is no alternative to concluding that Barth's refusal to accept the *apokatastasis* cannot be harmonised with the fundamental structure of his doctrine of election." *op.cit.*, p. 116.

Another closely allied question that is raised by Barth's thought here is the mechanistic way he develops the notion that man must serve God either as one of the elect or as one of the rejected. This would seem to rob man's subjective response to God of any decisiveness in his relation to Him. It is one thing to say that God remains sovereign even though He deals with man in such a way that He gives Himself into their hands to the point of allowing man to completely reject Him. In fact God's wisdom and sovereignty are actually revealed in that He gives Himself thus into man's hands, even allowing men to put Him to death, that He allows Himself to be determined by human contingency and response, and yet at the same time is able to reconcile man to Himself, to bring man back to Himself at this very point where man seeks to drive Him out of his life. It is another thing to say that the Cross and Resurrection are the eternal decree of God in that they reveal the nature of His eternal reconciliation with man as the twofold movement of rejection and election, of non-willing and willing.

---

[45] Barth, The Humanity of God, op. cit., p. 60.

[46] Ibid.

For when this latter position is taken, as Barth does, then the decisiveness of human action is seen only as it serves and attests the predetermined will of God. A certain indifference pervades concerning what man does in his life, for he cannot escape the service of God's two-fold will whatever he does. This comes out quite clearly in Barth's treatment of Judas Iscariot. He asks: "Can it be that the 'loving unto the end' of Jesus Christ does not reach him, the very one who in his person and act simply makes manifest the fact and extent that without His death Jesus had not yet loved His own unto the end?"[47] In other words is Judas' action really detrimental to him in light of the fact that he was serving the divine rejection, in that he was an instrument which revealed that which God rejected, which revelation must take place in order for His election to be seen as election?

---

[47] C.D., II/2, pp. 475, 476.

Such a conception which makes that which takes place in time the reflection of eternity, cannot help but rob time and that which takes place within it of significance. Moreover such a viewpoint seems to deny the very essence of the Incarnation - that God accommodates Himself to the human level and encounters us on the human plane and takes our human response to Him quite earnestly and seriously, so seriously that our relationship to Him is determined on the plane of human decision and response to the forgiveness He offers us in His Incarnate life.[48]

This mechanistic note which has its root in Barth's understanding of world history as the unfolding and confirming of primal history, runs throughout all the dogmatics. This is seen especially in the doctrine of reconciliation where Barth speaks about a change in man's situation but little about forgiveness or the relationship between Jesus Christ and sinful men. The meaning of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ seems rather to have the purpose of injecting into our history the content of primal history, to reveal to man the truth concerning him, i.e., that he is in Christ, that he is a part of the divine human reality - and thus to change his situation from one where he lacks knowledge of his ontological being to a knowing one in which he lives in correspondence to his knowledge.[49]

---

[48] I am indebted to George Hendry's book: The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, for the suggestion that God's grace as expressed in the Incarnation can best be described as both condescension and accommodation, an idea used here and throughout the concluding section; Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956.

This leads us to one final comment on Barth's doctrine of election - the distinction which he makes between the church and the world, between the Christian and non-Christian man, is a distinction formulated in purely noetic terms. In that in Jesus Christ the elect and rejected Man are one, the distinction between elect and rejected on the historical plane is blurred if not made totally indistinct. Thus Israel and the Church are seen primarily in their unity rather than in their distinctness, a fact which influences Barth's understanding of the Old Testament and which prevents him from actually seeing any progress between the two Testaments in terms of salvation history.[50] The same holds for individual men, they are distinguished by the fact that some know of their election in Jesus Christ and live as elect while others are ignorant of their election and live as rejected men, but this difference is unable to change the reality that in Jesus Christ the elect and rejected are one.

---

[49] Wingren is especially vigorous in his criticism of Barth on this point. He sees Barth as understanding man's problem before God solely in terms of a lack of knowledge of God and of understanding revelation in terms of opening man's blinded eyes to what is, always was and always will be. Thus in revelation the interest shifts from the triumph over evil which actually takes place in history. "The essential point is that evil is not a power opposed to God which God in a new act defeats on the last day. There are no new acts or events to be expected. Everything has already taken place. What we lack is insight. There is no evil power standing side by side with the kingdom of God, even though it may appear so to our blinded eyes. Revelation tells us that this is an illusion." Theology in Conflict, pp. 37, 8.

Such a viewpoint is very useful in keeping the church and its members from pride and in keeping the church open to the world, but it also has grave deficiencies. The most obvious is that the church in such a conception, despite Barth's own protests to the contrary, has no primary importance in reconciliation in that it is the sphere in which reconciliation takes place, for in fact reconciliation takes place apart from the church. Reconciliation is an eternal event which takes place in the election of the humanity of the Son of God and is fulfilled in time through the Incarnation. Man is in Christ objectively in this the action of God and this is so of all. Therefore the community has its place only in that in its life it gives the correspondence willed by God to this His eternal will. But in no sense can one say that to be in Christ takes place only as one is in the church, for this is not a decision made in the realm of human decision and response, but is already determined by God's eternal will.

---

[50] Thielicke, Helmut, Theologische Ethik, in 3 volumes, Tubingen, J.C.B. Mohr, 1951, 1958, v. 1, p. 194.

Nowhere does this come out clearer than in Barth's doctrine of the sacraments, or perhaps one should say, in the absence of a doctrine of the sacraments in his dogmatics. One of the interesting facts of the Dogmatik which has followed so closely the path which Barth marked out for himself in volume I, 2, section 24, 2, is the removal of the doctrine of the sacraments from its originally intended place in the doctrine of the church, to the projected ethical section of the doctrine of reconciliation.[51] Such a shift should cause little surprise if one has seen the pattern of Barth's thought. To the Reformers, it was the offer of God's grace made in the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the sacraments and the human response to it - the decision of faith - in which reconciliation, the being in Christ became an event, an event in need of continual renewal in the life of the Church. The Church was the sphere, the environment in which reconciliation took place in the full meaning of the word, as the Lord of the Church proclaimed Himself to its members, awakening in them the response of faith and trust.

---

[51] See C.D., I./2, p. 882; C.D. IV/2, pp. xi, xii.

But to think of the sacraments in this manner again raises the whole distinction between possibility and actuality, it places reconciliation in the realm of contingency and gives to human response and decision a place which for Barth usurps the one valid human response and decision made in Jesus Christ. Rather human response has its place within this one valid response made for men by Jesus Christ. Here and only here it has its own significance as a real human decision which attests the divine decision, an analogous action to the divine action, a correspondence to the decision made for man. Thus it is as ethical activity, as human correspondence to the divine action, that the sacraments have a place, but not as the means used by God to mediate His grace to man, since the mediation of grace is taken care of once and for all in Jesus Christ.

This comes out quite clearly in Barth's discussion on baptism in the short essay - Teaching on Baptism - where he argues for adult baptism as the preferable manner in which the sacrament is to be administered. Barth does not argue here as a Baptist, i.e., one who would make of the human decision of faith and baptism as the sign of this decision, a necessary part of man's salvation. "Our baptism is no more the cause of our redemption than is our faith."[52] Rather baptism has to do with our knowledge of salvation, with the cognitio salutis. In baptism a man acknowledges the complete divine-human reality which supports and surrounds him, he responds to this reality of which he is a part with his own being. Baptism involves the revelationary aspect of reconciliation, the fact that its reality reaches out to man's life and enlightens it. This is what takes place in baptism.

---

[52] Barth, The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism; trans. by Ernest A. Payne, London, S.C.M. Press, 1948, p. 27.

This is why infant baptism is a wrong, though not an invalid form of baptism. For here primary and secondary realities are confused in that the reconciliation which is an objective certainty in Jesus Christ and which includes the being of all is either made contingent upon the administration of a particular rite as in Roman Catholicism or as needing the response of the community on behalf of the individual placed within its midst, as in the Reformed tradition, while the very thing that baptism signifies - the taking cognisance of one's being in Christ - cannot take place. Nevertheless, Barth is quite emphatic that neither the order or practice of baptism nor the faith or piety of the individual determines its effectiveness and we return to the difficulty that came to the fore in volume IV, 3, that the cognitive aspect of reconciliation, the fact that it reaches out into man's life and awakens him to his reconciliation, is in itself an objective fact apart from the response of the individual.

Thus our study of Barth's doctrine of election has led us to raise the same problems with which we concluded our study of his doctrine of reconciliation, and to question all the more the solution which he poses to the question of the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity. In our concluding section to which we now turn we will seek to examine the reasons which have led Barth to the solution he has taken and then seek to evaluate this solution more fully.

Chapter VIII. GENERAL EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have now completed our survey of Barth's understanding of the relation of objectivity and subjectivity as it is developed in his doctrine of reconciliation and the other sections of his dogmatics, which in reality are inter-connected and not distinct from the doctrine of reconciliation. During much of this exposition a running criticism has been maintained, and therefore the purpose of this concluding section is not simply to restate this criticism as such. Rather the intent of these closing pages is to attempt first to look at the structure of Barth's theology as a whole, seeking to view the fundamental concern of his thought as a whole within which his peculiar formulation of the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity takes place; then to re-examine more thoroughly, what to this writer appear to be the main difficulties raised by this formulation; and finally to evaluate this formulation in the light of the dogmatic tradition as a whole.

Often times the basic intent of what a person is seeking to do in his own sphere of work is reflected by his observations and comments on the work of others in different spheres, or of those who have gone before him in his own field of endeavor. The approval or disapproval expressed is perhaps as good an indication as any of what the person making these comments is seeking to do in his own life work. It seems to this writer that this general observation can be applied to the work of Barth. Of course he has claimed that as a theologian he is merely seeking to hear God's Word - Jesus Christ - and give expression within the framework of the dogmatic tradition of the content of that Word. Thus Jesus Christ is determinative for him in relation to the four Loci of theological thought: the doctrine of God, of creation, of reconciliation and of redemption.

But as all of us, Barth hears this Word in a peculiar way, in a way determined by his own individual presuppositions. He is an 'earthen vessel' as all of us to whom the Gospel has been committed - a fact which he has not lost sight of himself but of which certain of his admirers seem woefully unaware. Thus what we are attempting to do here is to look at this 'earthen vessel' to see the way Barth conceives the task of theology itself, using as our point of departure his evaluation of others as a clue to his own manner of thought.

There are three places, among others, where Barth in his writings, so to speak, 'gives himself away.' The first of these - in the order which we will consider them - is revealed in his devotion to the music of Mozart and more importantly the reasons for which he has this devotion; the second is found in his essay on Hegel in his work on Protestant thought in the 19th century; and the third is his already mentioned comment on the Supralapsarian-Infralapsarian controversy of the 17th century.

There is no need to emphasise Barth's love for the music of Mozart - this has been repeated ad infinitum by others. One of the surest ways to call for the Olympian wrath of Barth is to attack his beloved Mozart, a fact with which the neo-Calvinists of the Netherlands are well acquainted.[1] In his latest autobiographical account just recently published in Christian Century he mentions the fact that a picture of Mozart along with that of Calvin occupies the place of honor in his study.[2]

However, we are not concerned here with Barth's love for Mozart in itself, but the reasons he gives for this love. The fact in itself is of no more importance than the fact that another theologian loves Bach while yet another is devoted to Beethoven. But Barth, as is so characteristic with him, has sought to give an objective basis to this his subjective preference, he has attached theological significance to Mozart's music, and it is this which interests us in that it provides a clue to Barth's thought.

---

[1] K.D., III/4, pp. ix, x; C.D., IV/2, p. xii.

[2] Barth, K., How My Mind Has Changed; The Christian Century, January 20, 1960, p. 76.

This significance he attaches to Mozart's music is developed in an extended note in volume III, 3, amidst the discussion of the general subject of the relation between God and the *Nichtige*. Barth draws the distinction between the *Nichtige* and that which he calls the shadowy side of creation, the negative aspect of the creaturely world, the fact that creation itself includes a No, the element of depth, of darkness and of decay. This, the negative aspect of creation, is, as part of creation, good, and along with the light side of creation praises its Creator and Lord.

It is this totality of the good creation which Mozart in his music was able to express. He knew both the twofold nature of creation and the fact that the creation in this twofold nature, in its totality, was good. Thus although he wrote his music at a time when the great Lisbon earthquake had shaken the belief of many in the goodness and kindness of God and had reopened or intensified the theodicy problem, Mozart was able to go beyond this, to escape the theodicy problem, leaving it without a struggle behind him, for he was able to hear both sides of God's good creation equally well, the No as well as the Yes, and know them both together as God's one good creation.

Thus his music is total music and this accounts for its incomparable worth and beauty. His music is beyond description because he has known something of the totality of the good creation in a way that the Church fathers, the Reformers, the Orthodox, the Liberal, the Existentialist theologians and even the other great musicians before and after him have not known, or in any case have not brought to expression.[3] He heard the dark and the bright tones of God's providential order together. "Mozart macht hörbar, dass die Schöpfung auch nach dieser Seite und also in ihrer Totalität ihren Meister lobt und also vollkommen ist."[4]

It is just this same note that we find repeated in Barth's theology over and over again. The existence of God's No as the servant of and included within His Yes; the attempt to see a fundamental harmony in which the No has its part along with the Yes in the one melody of God's grace. Along with this is a lack of concern on his part for such questions as the theodicy problem, for once one has understood the harmony of grace, such problems cease to be, or become at most, secondary problems. Thus one can see Barth's fundamental intention in theology as the attempt to see Jesus Christ as the one Word of God's grace, of God's Yes, of God's election, which includes in itself the word of God's No and rejection, thus including this negative element in the one reality of grace.

---

[3] K.D., III/3, p. 337.

[4] Ibid., p. 339.

Here, however, we must interject an objection before going on. Is such a conception possible either in regards to the music of Mozart or to theology itself? This is not to challenge the beauty and power of the music of Mozart but Barth's interpretation of it. If Mozart really was able to be undisturbed by the Lisbon earthquake and such events, was he really able to see this as part of the shadowy side of the good creation, then his music would be trite and uninteresting, he would really be the figure many people think him to be - the court musician of a royalty which lived its life in blissful ignorance of the tensions and realities, the struggles and sufferings which were all about them.

And how far is one to carry this? Is the Christian to hear in the cries that come from the gas chambers, in the reversion to barbarism that has so characterised our century, in the countless personal tragedies to which we have become hardened because of their number, the shadowy side of the good creation, knowing that these events are part of a whole that is good? The fact is, that there is a theodicy problem, and it is a burning problem which we cannot solve by speaking of God's Yes and No, but must struggle with and agonise over with no solution at hand.

This is just why Barth's doctrines of election, creation, and reconciliation have the tendency to be irrelevant. We are to approach every man as elected in Christ, as one to whom God has said Yes, as one who is ontologically bound as the brother of the man Jesus, as one whose judgment has been taken from him and who is in reality exalted with the humanity of Jesus to fellowship with God. And we can go further, for we know that whether this man accepts his election or not is not decisive, for even when he continues to live as though he were rejected, he bears witness to God's election, to that which God put behind Him when He elected humanity for Himself. The question raised by Charles West in connection with Barth's doctrine of election is quite in place: "What happens to the believer when he reads the marvellous way in which God weaves the destinies of the elected and rejected together for good, even for the good of the rejected? Only rejoicing in the mercies of God, or also a kind of sovereign indifference to the relative distinctions of good and evil in politics and society?"[5]

This is not to say in contrast to Barth's position, that the Christian is an eternal skeptic concerning the question of the goodness of God or of that which God primarily wills. But to look upon the world and see and hear an harmonious melody in which both God's Yes and No are woven together, is not a possibility open to us. Such a belief is rather a leap of faith in which we do not seek a solution to these problems but confess the solution is with God to be revealed in His own good time. To do more than this is to attempt to make the *eschaton* completely visible, to have a perfect system, a perfect knowledge of things here and now.

---

[5] West, Charles, Communism and the Theologians: Study of an Encounter, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1958, p. 245.

Thus the contention of this writer is that Barth has attempted to do in theology what he believes Mozart has done in music, namely, to construct a total theology which aims at perfect and complete harmony. In such an attempt Jesus Christ instead of being the One who redeems us in our existential need, and who continually fights with us against fear, doubt, anxiety and even unbelief, becomes the Revealer of a whole new sphere of reality in which we have our place and which we are called to know, acknowledge and confess in our lives, but who tends to have very little to say to the realities within which our lives are lived.

The tendency of Barth to seek to construct a total system is further seen in his evaluation of Hegel in the volume: *Protestant Thought from Rousseau to*

Ritschl.[6] One of the charges that has been brought against Barth continually is that he is unduly influenced by the thought of Hegel. Of course his understanding of being as an event, as history, as movement, as compared with a more static concept of being is certainly part of the legacy of Hegel that Barth would not wish to deny, although he would also claim that this understanding of being is founded in the revelation of the Word of God.

However, Barth continuously and vigorously denies that his concept of sin which has been compared with the Hegelian antithesis, in reaction to which reconciliation, or the synthesis, comes forth, is Hegelian. We are not so concerned, however, with comparing Barth to Hegel on particular points but rather in seeing if Barth in constructing his theological system has not been influenced in his understanding of just what the object of such a system is, by the philosophical work of Hegel. In this attempt the essay on Hegel is most instructive.

Bouillard in an interesting footnote on this essay, draws a comparison between the critique of Kierkegaard and that of Barth in relation to Hegel. Whereas Kierkegaard rejects the Hegelian philosophy and especially his interpretation of Christianity in the name of subjectivity and of the existential character of faith, Barth rejects it in the name of the divine freedom.[7] This is quite correct, for in his treatment of Hegel in this essay, no mention or protest is made against Hegel concerning the objectivity of his system of thought and its tendency to swallow up the individual existing man, making of him only a cog in a great movement.

---

[6] This is a translation of eleven chapters of Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert; New York, Harper & Brothers, 1959.

In fact just the opposite is the case, for he rejects this criticism that man is only a spectator in the Hegelian framework. The human subject rather is vitally concerned.

> It is in his looking and only in his looking that there is something seen. It is in his looking and only in his looking that the something seen is produced. And the thing seen actually has its reality in the fact that it is produced as the thing seen in the looking of the human subject. Man cannot participate more energetically (within the frame-work of theoretical possibility), he cannot be more forcefully transferred from the floor of the theatre on to the stage than in this history.[8]

Barth sees the significance of Hegel's work in inventing a universal method, a key to open every lock, an observation tower from which all things could be observed. With this key, this one rule, all things - the problem of natural reality, the concreteness of history, the secret of art, the texts of the Bible, the most primitive paths of the human peoples just as much as the decisions of the Lord Himself - could be interpreted. But people turned from this path of universal knowledge, they were frightened by it, they gave up the idea of having one thing, the whole, the quest for unity. They became interested in developing individual methedologies for individual sciences. The Enlightenment reached its pinnacle in Hegel, and intellectual development since this time, in the light of the ideals of the Enlightenment can only be regarded as a decline and a retrogression.[9]

---

[7] Bouillard, op. cit., v. 1., pp. 163, 164.

[8] Barth, Protestant Thought, p. 285.

More specifically, Hegel made invaluable contributions to theology. He reminded theology that it was concerned with truth, that it cannot be concerned with declarations, avowals, assertions, or symbols attempting to express the inexpressible, but with God Himself, with the final origin of everything given. Hegel also pointed to the possibility that truth might be history, event, that knowledge comes from a strict obedience to the self-movement of truth, of response to the living God whose life is real history. And finally he reminded theology of the contradictory nature of its own knowledge, pointing out that truth encompasses in unity that which seemed to be opposite.[10]

---

[9] *Ibid*., p. 292.

However, according to Barth, Hegel must be vigorously translated and transformed before he becomes acceptable to theology. Hegel erred in thinking that the concept of sin could be included in his system of thought, placing it in the finite nature of man as such and in the freedom of mind and thus understanding reconciliation not as an incomprehensible new beginning "but simply as a continuation of the one eventual course of truth, which is identical with the existence of God Himself."[11] Also Hegel failed to distinguish between the self-movement of truth and the self-movement of man, so that God could be understood merely as a God of man's thought, not as One who actually stood over against man and spoke to him in an objective way, whose objectivity could not be dissolved in the thought of man. Finally, in that Hegel identified God with the dialectical method, he made God His own prisoner. God _must_ function as we see Him function in revelation, His revelation is necessary, as are creation and reconciliation. "Hegel in making the dialectical method of logic the essential nature of God, made impossible the knowledge of the actual dialectic of grace, which has its foundation in the freedom of God."[12]

---

[10] _Ibid_., pp. 299, 300.

[11] _Ibid_., p. 302.

[12] _Ibid_., p. 304.

It is in fact here, that his other failures have their roots - "in the failure to recognise double predestination."[13]

Barth's essay ends on a melancholy note. If only Hegel had gone further, if he had only been a little more in earnest from the theological point of view. But then he would not have been Hegel, and we must understand him as the man he was, "as a great problem and a great disappointment, but perhaps a great promise."[14]

Note, that it is not Hegel's desire to have a universal key to knowledge nor his understanding of truth as the movement of God Himself and man as the knower of this movement, but his failure to mark off the freedom of God, his attempt to see this as a necessary process, as the life of God Himself apart from which God has no life. It is not too much to say that Barth has corrected these mistakes in his own theology, in his own doctrine of double predestination, in which the freedom of God is exalted and the whole movement of God's life *ad extra* is seen as pure grace.

But here again we pause for a moment. Is this enough? Does Barth by speaking of double predestination, of God's willing and non-willing, really escape the concept of sin found in Hegel's thought? Does not his desire for universal truth, the truth of God Himself, the truth of the origin of all things, which he finds in the Word of God, not lead inescapably to a viewing of sin that is barely distinguishable from Hegel's? Is it enough to say that before the beginning of all things God elected reconciliation and rejected a graceless being, not of necessity, nor automatically, but in freedom, in order for the disruptive and non-systematic character of sin to be perceived? We have seen throughout that Barth seems unable to overcome his tendency to view sin as a necessary counterpart to God's grace, as providing a stage upon which grace can reveal itself as grace.

---

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

Or again, though Barth recognises the tendency of Hegel and his system to stress the realm of thought as that of the essence of man, ignoring the will and feelings, does not his own system have the same tendency? Is not man essentially a knower for Barth, one who is determined to be the recipient of the divine revelation, a revelation which includes him and his participation in it apart from his faith, so that the essential difference between Christian and non-Christian is noetic?

Further we must ask, is the attempt to have a key to all knowledge, a rule that provides unity for all things, really possible within the limits of our humanity, even if this key is the Word of God itself? We have observed continually how Barth seeks to ground all knowledge, all truth from the one Truth of the Word of God, but such an attempt has seemed to us both constricting and artificial.

Finally, the influence of Hegel in terms of his interest in truth in itself, with God Himself, is quite pronounced. Thus Barth absolutely sets himself against all who would draw a distinction between the knowledge of God which comes to us in revelation and the knowledge of God Himself, for such a division makes revelation a questionable thing and empties it of its seriousness. If God does not reveal Himself, if His own life-act is not the content of revelation, then it is not revelation. Thus any attempt to concentrate on the benefits of Christ, or to speak of the limits of our knowledge of God are swept aside. Man's determination as man is to be a hearer of the Word of God and in this Word God Himself lives His life, He is in His movement ad extra exactly what He is in Himself, the loving Father and the obedient Son in the unity of the Holy Spirit.

But we have seen again and again in our study what difficulties this whole conception of revelation involves. Relationships which have meaning only in the earthly sphere of things are taken up into the life of God. We hear of grace as having a place in the inner-Trinitarian life, of superiority and subordination, of an I-Thou relationship, which threatens to make the whole concept of God absurd, and which tends to blur the distinction between God and man, making of man one mode or element in the life of God Himself.

One of the words that is lacking in Barth's vocabulary is that of accommodation, and perhaps this can be traced to the influence of Hegel upon him. Man can know nothing of God without the Word of God, but in the event in which the Word is revealed, all barriers are broken down and man is taken up to know the very life of God Himself. The thing of which Calvin was so aware - the accommodation of God to our situation, His lisping with us as a nurse with a child, his warning against an undue interest in the essence of God - is not found in Barth. Rather there is the continual tendency to break through the limitations in which theology and man's knowledge are placed and assert a competence in matters where theology would be better to remain silent, a tendency which Balthasar rightly describes as leading inevitably to a systematic formulation.[15]

The final place which we have chosen as providing us with an indication of the intent of Barth's theological work as a whole is the aforementioned discussion of the Supralapsarian-Infralapsarian controversy in Reformed orthodoxy. Barth is sympathetic to what both sides were attempting to express in their conflict, and he has no desire to defend the Supralapsarian position as it was formulated in the 17th century. Nevertheless, he sees in their position the right intent and purpose, for the Supralapsarians realised that God had a primal and basic purpose which was to be taken into account apart from His other purposes, namely creation and the fall, and to which all other purposes were subordinated, whereas the Infralapsarians spoke of God's efficient and permissive will in creation and the fall and of His decree of predestination which was subordinated to or put alongside of this other decree, so that the existence of man and of sin, were not included in the decree of predestination.

---

[15] Balthasar, op. cit., p. 255.

Both sides were at fault in that they spoke of the object of the decree of predestination as the individual, abstractly understood, but the Supralapsarians at least treated the question of predestination aright in that they viewed it as God's primal and basic intent. In the struggle that ensued the Infralapsarian position triumphed, but this triumph could only bode ill for theology. It is interesting to see just how seriously Barth treats this question, for he views the triumph of the Infralapsarians as swinging open the gates to natural theology and the whole movement of the Enlightenment.

> The whole process of rejecting Supralapsarianism must, in fact, be numbered as one of the signs of exhaustion which characterise 17th century theology - an exhaustion which made it powerless to resist the Enlightenment at the beginning of the 18th century, since it carried within it the seed of theological Enlightenment and its own dissolution. The theological Enlightenment was nothing more than the exhaustion of thinking upon a basis of faith, for in proportion as such thinking was exhausted it was inevitably replaced by thinking upon a basis of unbelief.[16]

We have already mentioned Barth's attempt to draw the outlines of what a purified Supralapsarian position would involve and it is certainly valid to designate his whole dogmatic endeavor as an attempt to present just such a position. Thus we have the humanity of God, in which God makes His being the being of that which stands over against Him and in which this being is obedient to this condescension of God and praises God as His partner, as the primal reality, the basic decree from which all reality is to be seen and understood. The election of Jesus Christ - this is the basic reality, subordinate to which are creation and the fall.

But here again we must pause and question, for our study of Barth's theology has continually raised doubts in our mind as to whether this purified supralapsarianism can avoid the pitfalls and dangers of the old supralapsarianism. This is the issue we have seen emerging constantly in Barth's desire to avoid the step-wise character of God's revelation and the problems attendant upon this. In such a conception in which reconciliation between God and man is made the primal reality, do not both creation and sin lose their decisiveness and importance, in effect, become docetised, and along with this the whole sphere of human history and human decision relativised to a secondary reality?

---

[16] C.D., II/2, p. 144.

This is not to say that the sphere of creation and reconciliation are to be torn apart into complete independence or that reconciliation is to be subordinated to creation, but unless the sphere of creation is granted enough independence from that of reconciliation, so that the man who stands over against God is not viewed as a man who is reconciled in the very fact that he is but as a man who in his life history is called to decision for or against God, which decision is determinative of his relationship with God, then the importance of this historical existence is jeopardised. Creation, history and human decision are then seen merely as the allowing to man of the space and time to confirm that which stands as ontically true of his being apart from his confirmation of it, and man's sin is seen not as a really serious matter, but as man's flirtation with that which has already had its power and force emptied from it.

This is not to discount the doctrine of election as unimportant or invalid, but it is to raise serious questions as to whether it can be made the key and cornerstone of a theological system which attempts to take seriously the sphere of human decision and contingency. Barth thoroughly rejects Calvin's approach to this subject by appealing to its pedagogic usefulness and its relation to experience,[17] but in a sense, it is here that the doctrine of election has its place. The doctrine of election is the implicate of faith, the confession of the community and the individual that God Himself has opened him to His grace, that the response he has made as his own decision, stems not from his own strength and wisdom but has its basis solely in God's gracious condescension to him. In that God has brought him to the decision of faith, in that he now experiences God's forgiveness and acceptance in his life, he also knows this relationship with God to be the fulfillment of God's eternal love and will.

To go beyond this and draw implications concerning those who do not appear to our eyes to be the recipients of grace - as Calvin did - is wrong, though it may appear as the logical thing to do; but Calvin cannot be commended too highly for maintaining his doctrine of election within the sphere of soteriology. It is one of the marks which distinguishes the Institutes as primarily intended for catechetical instruction rather than as the attempt to systematically expound the totality of God's will and ways.

---

[17] Ibid., pp. 37-39.

Thus an examination of these three clues to the intent of Barth's dogmatics has led us to the conclusion that his theology represents the attempt to express in a systematic way the whole truth concerning the Word of God, which is the truth of God Himself and the key to an understanding of all reality distinct from God. We have here an attempt to write 'total theology,' an attempt to follow the life-movement of God Himself and the subordination of all truth to this which is primary truth. But we have also seen that such an attempt has a tendency to run rough-shod over the realities of human experience and life, when the data of such experience contradicts the conclusions of this systematic endeavor.

In other words, though Barth's theology solves certain problems it also creates others. It is not the purpose of this concluding section to examine all these problems in toto but only as they are related to the question of the relationship of objectivity and subjectivity. Barth has closed the door to the tension and division between possibility and actuality, between the work of Christ for us and our own response to this work, by including the latter in the former, by making subjectivity an integral part of objectivity, by making human response part of the one and perfect work of Christ. But in so doing he has raised other tensions and problems of which two stand out in particular. Perhaps these problems can best be stated in the form of two questions:

1. Can a solution which includes human subjectivity within the divine objectivity, allow human personality and response a real freedom and independence, a true 'standing-over-againstness' in relation to God?
2. Can such a viewpoint allow the human response which is in essence a correspondence to the already valid and effective human response made in the humanity of Jesus, to be more than a secondary and in the last analysis unimportant factor in the relationship between God and man?

The first question involves Barth's understanding of the human reality of Jesus Christ. We have seen continually how he employs the concepts of _an_ and _en hypostasia_ as the key to the understanding of the relation between deity and humanity in His Person. The humanity of Jesus Christ has no independent being apart from His deity, but rather has its reality, its being in union with the deity, as it gives place to, is obedient to, attests and follows after the deity. This relationship, moreover, is seen as being analogous to the inner-Trinitarian life of Father and Son and as having its analogy in the life of mankind in general as it is related to Christ. We will not explore the first of the deductions drawn from the Person of Jesus Christ except to note again its awkwardness and inconceivability, for the concept of an and en hypostasia would seem to have validity only when one speaks of two different natures in union with one another.

What does concern us is the attempt to interpret our humanity in terms of the humanity of Jesus Christ as it is conceived in this formulation. Our humanity is viewed as having its being within the divine-human reality - Jesus Christ - and as having its being as it gives place to, is obedient to, attests and follows after the divine-human reality, in short, as it is determined by Jesus Christ. Thus as Jesus Christ was truly free as a man in that He had no choice but to follow after His divine determination, so our freedom is understood in the same light. Thus our being is our being in Christ and our subjectivity consists in corresponding willingly and actively to our being.

Such a concept of the place of human subjectivity seems quite insufficient. In the first place it is an open question whether that which is implied in the an and en hypostasia is really adequate to explain the relation of deity and humanity in the Person of Jesus Christ, as to whether or not this is a going beyond the Chalcedonian formula in a way which is actually forbidden by the four negative adverbs of the formula itself. There are two directions one can take in attempting to elucidate the mystery of the Incarnation - one can either stress the deity as the key to understanding the humanity, or the humanity as the key to understanding the deity. The approach Barth adopts takes this first alternative, but the question is immediately raised whether or not such an approach does not in the end make the humanity something less than it really is, even as the opposite approach seems to always result in viewing the deity merely as the development of one of the capacities of humanity in an infinite degree.

When such a formulation as that described by the _an_ and _en hypostasia_ is applied to humanity in its relation to Christ the problem intensifies. If human life be viewed as a history, as a series of decisions, then it must always be understood as a history which can only follow the primal history out of which it derives, or as human decision acknowledging the divine decision. Man's subjectivity is limited to movement on a one way street.

But as has been mentioned before, such an understanding of man threatens to reduce him to the place where he is a mode of a mode (Jesus Christ) of a mode (Sonship) of the being of God. The root of this problem is Barth's desire to subordinate anthropology to christology, for in that christology is the key to the knowledge of God as well as man, man's relationship to Jesus

Christ is seen as having its original analogue in God's own being as Father and Son. Now, unless one is willing to speak of Father and Son as two divine Persons - which Barth is manifestly opposed to doing - then the relationship between Father and Son can in no way have its analogy in the relationship of Jesus Christ and humanity in general, without having recourse to such a concept as the _totus Christus_ which in effect reduces man to a mode of the divine-human reality. One can talk all one pleases about an encounter between an I and a Thou in the being of God, but to speak of the divine-human encounter as analogous to this divine encounter is quite wrong for even if there is such an encounter in the life of God, the I and the Thou are nevertheless One, which is exactly what cannot be said of man's relation to Jesus Christ if human subjectivity is to be preserved in more than an enervated form.

In other words, the reality of creation cannot be completely subordinated to reconciliation. It is the man to whom God gives an independent standing - who truly encounters God as an other - not an other who in actuality is already one with Him, to whom God determined to relate Himself. God's determination does not include in itself its actual fulfilment, but He is ceaselessly active to bring about this fulfilment through condescending to the level of mankind and accommodating Himself to the life of man in order that this fulfilment might in no way steamroller man or make of him a puppet but be a freely given response in which man exercises his subjectivity in the fullest sense of the word, and apart from which subjective response, the fulfilment of His determination remains unrealised.

To speak of man's subjective response leads us however, directly into the second question which we posed - that given the framework in which Barth understands human subjectivity, can the human response for which room is allowed in correspondence to the already valid and effective response made in the humanity of Jesus Christ, be more than a secondary factor in the relationship between God and man. Or to put the question in the terminology with which we have grown familiar, can the de facto realisation of reconciliation amount to much after all in the light of the de iure realisation which takes place for all men in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ apart from their own response; or in terms of the doctrine of election, does not the primal reality of man's being elect in and with the election of Jesus Christ really neutralise or make secondary anything man does in his own life-act?

This is one of the unresolved problems of Barth's theology in that as we have seen he is unwilling to draw out the implications of his own thought on the subject as has been mentioned time and time again.

In terms of the last question, in relation to the inner-Trinitarian life and the movement of this life *ad extra* in the election of Jesus Christ, the question of determination and fulfilment pose no problem, but this is not the case on the human level, for quite obviously not all men fulfil their determination of being elect in Jesus Christ and those that do, correspond to their election most inadequately. Therefore we have the case of man fighting against his own being, fighting against that which he is - elected in Jesus Christ, the brother of the man Jesus, the one whose death has been put behind him and who is exalted to fellowship with God, and who is called to the knowledge of this his true being.

In this opposition one of these factors must predominate. Either man's being in Christ, his *de iure* justification, sanctification and calling must be seen as the truth concerning him, which he cannot alter or escape whatever he does in his own life-act, or man's response to this his being in Christ must be viewed as the decisive decision which determines whether he remains in Christ or puts himself outside of Christ.

However, if this latter is the case, then it becomes difficult to avoid the conclusion that the very thing for which Barth has been striving - to make reconciliation an actuality in Jesus Christ, denying the division between possibility and actuality - is lost. No matter how strongly and vigorously one stresses the objectivity of reconciliation in Jesus Christ, if one by his personal action and decision can escape his reconciliation then the human correspondence to the divine decision must be seen as constituitive of the reality of reconciliation itself and the same problems against which Barth is fighting reappear. Simply to say that the possibility offered to man by his decision is to step outside of the reality of reconciliation rather than the possibility to enter into this reality, makes little difference in the final analysis. Therefore, the only conclusion can be that what takes place in the sphere of human history and human decision cannot be compared to what takes place in the sphere of primal history, in the sphere of God's decision, and since in this sphere man is elect in Christ and reconciled to God this is a reality which cannot be touched or altered by his own decision, and thus his own decision becomes purely peripheral and secondary.

But is not this conclusion really to pervert the heart of the Gospel, a fact which no doubt partially explains Barth's reluctance to state this conclusion openly and dogmatically? Is the Incarnation the breaking forth into world history of the truth of eternity, the manifestation on the temporal plane of the pre-temporal and primal decree of God, the noetic disclosure of the ontic structure of reality, which ontic structure itself includes this noetic disclosure? In other words, does the Word become flesh in order to reveal to flesh that it never was without the Word? Or does the Word become flesh, does God enter into human life, in order to establish a relationship with man on the human level, accommodating Himself to our lives, enabling us to respond to Him, so that reconciliation, the purpose of God's eternal love, is actually fulfilled in and through human decision and response in which one now in relation to the Incarnate Son of God experiences his own sonship with God, and which event continues to take place through the gift of the Holy Spirit by the living Christ to His community, empowering it to bear witness to Him.

Let it be said here that such an alternative to Barth's thought as suggested here is not a return to Pelagianism or an attempt to give a place to human cooperation as an element in reconciliation, but rather to emphasize what seems so basic to the New Testament revelation, that reconciliation does not take place over our heads, as a fait accompli in which God's relationship with man is determined completely in what takes place in the humanity of Jesus Christ, set in our place, and then presented to us irresistably as the reality of which we are a part, but that reconciliation takes place in the relationship of Jesus Christ to sinful men, in which one encounters the forgiving grace of God in this Man in such a way that he is enabled freely to accept this grace and trust in Jesus Christ as the Saviour and Lord of his life. In such a relationship the question of merit and deserving is irrelevant and besides the point, for the mark of the genuineness of this relationship will be the utter thankfulness and humility one will have in relation to God who so condescends and accommodates Himself to man. The point is not then to stress human cooperation but the true grace of God who does not reconcile men in a mechanistic way but reconciles them by entering into relationship with them and not apart from this relationship.

It is interesting to note how little Barth speaks of the actual relationship between Jesus Christ and sinful men in which a man receives the forgiveness of God and knows himself as accepted and included in God's love and grace. Jesus Christ comes to change man's ontological situation, to remove in time and world history the threat of godlessness and judgment which God had already put behind Him from all eternity. He comes to raise men to fellowship with God not by actually entering into relationship with other men but by taking man's place and returning as man's representative to His appointed place at the right hand of God. He is the revelation of God's reconciliation, of the divine-human reality which is His life, apart from man's response to this revelation. He justifies, sanctifies and calls man in fact by what He is and does apart from them; He reveals the ontological fact of their being in Him quite apart from their faith. To all this reality man can and should correspond in his life, acting in his time and place analogously to the action of Jesus Christ and thus a place is preserved for Christian faith, love and hope. But reconciliation does not take place here, but in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ alone.

In the light of the above, we must conclude that Barth's attempt to include human subjectivity within the divine objectivity is not acceptable. The divine objectivity, God's condescension to man in Jesus Christ, is the basis of human subjectivity, this is what calls forth the relationship between God and man and apart from this foundation there could be no human subjectivity. But this subjectivity is a genuinely distinct element alongside of the divine objectivity and cannot be included as part of it.

Thus in terms of the controversy between Bultmann and Barth mentioned at the start of this paper we cannot give the palm of victory to either. The answer to the question which is in the right, can only be, neither.

Certainly, and here Barth is entirely right, reconciliation does not take place merely in the decision of faith in which man steps over from living under the lordship of the world and of things and places himself under the Lordship of God. But neither can we say that reconciliation takes place completely in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ apart from the human response to Him, or that the human response is completely taken care of in His Person and Work.

It would be disastrous for theology to be driven to an either-or decision in this matter, to choose up sides and man the battle lines. Reconciliation takes place neither exclusively in the years A.D. 1-33, or in the year A.D. 1960 but in the relationship between the One who was God in the flesh and who brought the forgiveness of God to the life of man through His act of condescension and accommodation, and the one who is made alive by this act and thus enabled to make a free response of faith to it. This is why the church and the proclamation of the Word and administration of the sacraments are part of the work of reconciliation itself, for it is here, through these instruments, that the living Jesus Christ by His Holy Spirit actually enters into relationship with men; it is here that the on going work of reconciliation, and understood in these terms, the extentsion of the Incarnation takes place.

If one desires to speak of these two realities - Jesus Christ reaching out to sinful man and sinful man responding to Jesus Christ - as the objective and subjective aspects of reconciliation, then it must be stressed both are indispensible. Certainly it is only in the condescension and accommodation of God to man's life that reconciliation is possible, but the glory of God's love, the true greatness of His power, is that He manifests Himself in weakness, humbles Himself to our condition and reconciles us not by sweeping us upward in a great heavenly movement, but in and through our human decision and response, a decision and response for which we take no merit, which we know to be totally dependent on His self-disclosure to us, but which nevertheless remains our act.

If God approaches man on his own level, then the relationship between God and man must be analogous to the relationship between man and man. In such a relationship objectivity and subjectivity cannot be torn apart or separated. For example in the relationship between husband and wife the reality of the marriage relationship depends on the fact that both partners in their subjective response to one another are subjectively responding to that which is objectively the truth concerning them. Subjectivity in and of itself is insufficient for a lasting relationship, but on the other hand that which is objectively the truth concerning each partner cannot be established apart from subjectivity. Only in their relationship, in their subjective response to one another is the objective truth of what they are revealed. Objectivity cannot be known apart from subjectivity and yet subjectivity itself in order to be genuine is dependent upon objectivity.

In the relationship between Jesus Christ and sinful men the same is the case. Faith which is the human response to this One in whom God humbles Himself and comes to us, will never invert upon itself, it will not make of itself an idol, but will always look to the One who has called him to faith, to the revelation of God in His life. Nor will faith on the other hand seek to construct a wall of objectivity until it is able to speak of a relationship to God apart from faith and of a reconciliation that takes place in a sphere which is independent of one's faith.

In other words, the distinction between the second and third sections of the Apostle's Creed is a valid one - the work of the Holy Spirit and the subjective appropriation of the work of Jesus Christ cannot be absorbed by the second article and seen as being simply a fuller definition of His Person and Work, but involves a definite and distinct second step. This is what Calvin sought to express in the sharp break he made between Book II and Book III in the Institutes. The Person and Work of Christ, God's grace active and at work here is alone what enables any saving relationship to take place between God and man, but His life in itself is not the completed reconciliation. Rather reconciliation takes place as His Holy Spirit awakens man to faith in Him as the Reconciler and not apart from this act of faith.[18] And it is in this relationship to Jesus Christ which does not take place outside of faith, that a man knows God as His Justifier and Sanctifier - his justification and sanctification and calling are the content of the relationship which he has with the Incarnate Christ.

In view of this Barth's endeavor to construct a wall of objectivity which removes the event of reconciliation from the threat of contingency and uncertainty must be rejected. Barth has entitled his theological endeavor Church Dogmatics and has emphasised over and over again that the dogmatic task is that of faith seeking understanding. That would seem to indicate that the function of dogmatics is largely catechetical, that it is intended to elucidate the content of faith. This means as Calvin rightly pointed out that theology can either begin with the knowledge of God or the knowledge of man, because true theological endeavor leads from theology to anthropology and from anthropology to theology, and furthermore the one cannot be absorbed in the other. This is exactly what Barth fails to realise, and acknowledge - anthropology cannot be made simply an implicate of christology, of the objective revelation.

---

[18] Calvin, Institutes; see Book III, Argument and chapters 1 and 2.

Bouillard in a very perceptive evaluation of Barth's understanding of the act of the human subject, poses the question of whether Barth in his reaction against 19th century Liberalism has not gone to an opposite extreme which is just as much a perversion as that against which he reacts.

> Barth reproche à Schleiermacher de tendre, malgré ses intentions, à dissoudre l'élément objectif du christianisme, la Parole de Dieu, dans l'élément subjectif, la foi. Mais ne tend-il pas à son tour et pareillement malgré lui, à dissoudre l'accueil de la révélation dans la révélation objective? Et s'il est vrai, comme il l'estime que Schleiermacher tend à un système de l'identité, n'y va-t-il pas lui-même en sens inverse? Au lieu de résorber Dieu dans la conscience religieuse, il semblerait parfois résorber la réalité intime de la foi dans l'acte de la Parole divine.[19]

We have seen this tendency - the attempt of Barth to include this subjective response in the objectivity of God's work itself - throughout the dogmatics in the areas we have studied, and it is a note that pervades the entire work.[20]

---

[19] Bouillard, op. cit., v. 3., pp. 17, 18.

[20] For example see C.D., II/1 section 26,2: The Readiness of Man. Here there is stated in nuce the whole content of Barth's doctrine of reconciliation. Man's readiness for God must be viewed christologically, it is

The eternal decision of God seeks correspondence in time, but is not dependent on this correspondence in time for its reality. And this eternal decision is the humanity of the Son of God which includes in His humanity our own being. This reconciliation between God and man, this divine-human reality is the primal source from which all reality stems, so that creation and what takes place within it, decision for or against God, either deny this reality or is analogous to it, but does not in any sense effect it.

---

here and here alone that man's readiness for God is a reality. In that the Son knows the Father and the Son is not the Son without the flesh, we participate in this readiness for God. (p. 151) Or again: "By the fact that He is for us in eternity in God Himself the man who is ready for God, it is executed in eternity, in God Himself, by Him, in the eternal continuation of His high-priestly office. But this means - and what follows can only be a sequel and explanation of this proper and original truth - that Jesus Christ Himself sees to it that in Him and by Him we are not outside but inside. He Himself sees to it that His readiness is valid for us who are not identical with Him, and who in ourselves are not ready for God. He sees to it that what is true in Him in the height is and remains true in our depth." (p. 156) And he concludes, that the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of the unity of the Father and the Son, of their being in and for one another, guarantees that in the height of God there is only a 'For us,' spoken and true once and for all, which rules over anything that may happen in the depth, anything that may take place in our enmity against grace. Thus the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the church and on those inside the church is nothing but the unity of the Father and Son in the form of time, among us whose existence is not yet at home with the Lord, but who in Jesus Christ are in reality already there, and the faith which He works in us is the temporal form of our eternal being in Christ, which is the truth concerning us. (pp. 158, 159)

It is just this fact revealed to us in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ for He takes our place from us, standing alone as the recipient of God's wrath and judgment, and also as the recipient of God's election which exalts Him to fellowship with God. He justifies, sanctifies and calls men validly in what He is and does, finally and irrevocably.

Such a wall of objectivity certainly has its advantages and offers a solution to many problems. The tension between the realms of creation and reconciliation is solved; human freedom is seen as having its one and only meaning within the divine determination; theology need no longer fear the charge of the philosopher that it is merely a hidden form of anthropology for it now speaks of the life of God Himself, of Truth and the Origin of things, of the ways and work of God which in itself includes anthropology; and the problems of faith and history, of religious experience become secondary and rather non-important matters.

But the question which must finally be put to such a system, the question we have been repeating throughout this study in one form or another, is whether such a solution does not in the end solve these problems only by a *tour de force* of thought, while they remain very much with us in reality. To this writer, the meaning of the Incarnation is that God wills to relate Himself to us within the ambiguities and natural tensions of human life. Reconciliation takes place in history, in the sphere where the Man Jesus speaks and acts and where man hears and responds. This implies that God takes the otherness of man seriously, that man is truly over against God, that God grants the creation a real independence in order that the relations between Him and the creature might not be merely a divine monologue, but a true dialogue.

Thus man is a person with a spirit, analogous to the Triune God Himself, and not merely contained within one of the Trinitarian relationships. Because God grants the creature true independence his freedom is more than the freedom to confirm his being, but is freedom for decision for or against God, the freedom actually to lose his freedom and become enslaved to himself or a false god. And it is to man who has actually lost his freedom in his life-history, who is sinful man, to whom God comes in Jesus Christ forgiving him and accepting him, and thus restoring his freedom so that he can once again respond to God, knowing God as his Justifier and Sanctifier, as the One who gives him peace, grants him sonship, while at the same time calling him into the fellowship of service in which he must bear the cross.

Since God truly accommodates Himself to the anthropological sphere, since He reconciles man through what He does in this sphere, and since He does not reconcile man without his response, theology will continually have to speak of possibility and actuality, of determination and fulfilment. What's more, it will continually have to face the charge that its work is merely anthropology; and the problems of faith and history will always be primary, while Christian experience will be subject to thorough psychological analysis which may seek to explain it away as merely one phenomenon among many similar phenomena.

But these uncertainties, these risks cannot be avoided. They must be taken, for to do so is to follow in the path of the Incarnate Son Himself. Was not the very risk God took in becoming Incarnate in the life of the man Jesus the risk that His Incarnate life would be interpreted in purely human categories? The attempt to avoid these risks, to establish certainty, to rule out contingency, to construct an unshakeable wall of objectivity in which subjectivity is included, is tempting, but to this writer, it cannot be the way taken by Christian theology in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works by Karl Barth.

A. German editions.

Barth, Karl, *Die Auferstehung der Toten: Eine akademische Vorlesung über I.Kor. 15*; Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag A.G., 1953.

-----------, *Calvin*; Theologische Existenz Heute, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Heft 37, 1936.

-----------, *Christengemeinde und Burgergemeinde*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag A.G., Heft 20, 1946.

-----------, *Die christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf, Erster Band: Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes*; München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1927.

-----------, *Erklarung des Philipperbriefes*; Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., 1943.

-----------, *Evangelische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., Heft 49, 1957.

-----------, *Evangelium und Gesetz*; Theologische Existenz Heute, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Heft 32, 1935.

-----------, *Fides Quaerens Intellectum: Anselms Beweis der Existenz Gottes im Zusammenhang seines theologischen Programms*, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1931.

-----------, *Das Geshenk der Freiheit: Grundlegung evangelischer Ethik*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., Heft 39, 1953.

-----------, *Gottes Gnadenwahl*; Theologische Existenz Heute, München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Heft 47, 1936.

-----------, *Humanismus*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., Heft 28, 1950.

-----------, *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*; I/1, I/2, II/1, II/2, III/1, III/2, III/3, III/4, IV/1, IV/2, IV/3, 1, IV/3, 2, München and Zollikon-Zürich, Chr. Kaiser Verlag and Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., 1932-1959.

-----------, *Die Menschlichkeit Gottes*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, A.G., Heft 48, 1956.

-----------, *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert: ihre Vorgeschichte und ihre Geschichte*; Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag A.G., 1947.

-----------, *Rechtfertigung und Recht*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag A.G., Heft 1, 1944.

-----------, *Der Romerbrief*; Bern, G.A. Baschlin, 1919.

-----------, *Rudolf Bultmann: Ein Versuch, ihn zu verstehen*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag A.G., Heft 34, 1952.

-----------, *Die Schrift und die Kirche*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag A.G., Heft 22, 1947.

-----------, *Die Souveränität des Wortes Gottes und die Entscheidung des Glaubens*; Theologische Studien, Zollikon, Verlag der Evangelischen Buchhandlung, Heft 5, 1939.

-----------, *Theologische Fragen und Antworten: Band 3 of Gesammelte Vortrage*; Zollikon, Evangelischer Verlag A.G., 1957.

B. English translations and writings.

Barth, Karl, *Against the Stream: Shorter Post-War Writings, 1946-1952*; translated by E. M. Delacour and Stanley Goodman, London, S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1954.

-----------, *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*; translated by T.A. Snail, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1956-1957.

-----------, *Church Dogmatics*; I/1, I/2, II/1, II/2, III/1, IV/1, IV/2; editors, G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1936-1958.

-----------, *Credo: A Presentation of the chief Problems of Dogmatics with reference to the Apostle's Creed*; translated by J.S. McNab, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1936.

-----------, *Dogmatics in Outline*; translated by G.T. Thomson, London, S.C.M. Press, 1949.

-----------, The Epistle to the Romans; translated from the 6th German edition by Edwyn C. Hoskyns, London, Oxford University Press, 1933.

-----------, The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostle's Creed according to Calvin's Catechism; translated by Gabriel Vahanian, New York, Meridian Books, Inc., 1958.

-----------, How My Mind Has Changed; The Christian Century, Chicago, Volume 77, No. 3, Jan, 20, 1960, pp. 72-76.

-----------, The Humanity of God; originally three studies in Theologische Studien: Evangelische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, Die Menschlichkeit Gottes, and Das Geschenk der Freiheit; translated by Thomas Wieser and John Newton Thomas, Richmond, Va., John Knox Press, 1960.

-----------, Protestant Thought: From Rousseau to Ritschl; a translation of eleven chapters of Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert; New York, Harper & Brothers, 1959.

-----------, The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism: translated by Ernest A. Payne, London, S.C.M. Press, 1948.

-----------, The Word of God and the Word of Man; translated by Douglas Horton, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1957.

-----------, and Emil Brunner, Natural Theology: Comprising Nature and Grace by Emil Brunner and the reply 'No' by Karl Barth; translated by Peter Fraenkel, London, Centenary Press, 1946.

II. Special Studies of the Theology of Karl Barth.

von Balthasar, Hans Urs, Karl Barth: Darstellung und Deutung Seiner Theologie; Köln, Verlag Jakob Hegner, 1951.

Berkouwer, G.C., The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth; translated by Harry R. Boer, Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1956.

Bouillard, Henri, Karl Barth; vol. 1: Genèse et Évolution de la Théologie Dialectique; vols. 2,3: Parole de Dieu et Existence Humaine; Aubier, Éditions Montaigne, 1957.

Bromiley, G.W., The Doctrine of the Atonement: A Survey of Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik IV/1, Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd Ltd., Vol. 8, 1955, pp. 175-187.

--------------, The Doctrine of Reconciliation: A Survey of Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik IV/2, Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd Ltd., Vol. 10, 1957, pp. 76-85.

Brunner, Emil, The New Barth; Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd Ltd., Vol. 4, 1951, pp. 123-135.

Cochrane, Arthur C., The Doctrine of Sanctification: Review of Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik IV/2; Theology Today, Princeton, Vol. 13, 1956, pp. 376-388.

Ebneter, Albert, Der Mensch in der Theologie Karl Barths; Zurich, Orientierung, 1956.

Godsey, John, The Architecture of Karl Barth's Dogmatics; Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd Ltd., Vol. 9, 1956, pp. 236-250.

Gollwitzer, Helmut, Karl Barth: Kirchliche Dogmatik: Ausgewählt und Eingeleitet; Frankfurt, Fischer Bücherei, 1957.

Hendry, George S., The Dogmatic Form of Barth's Theology; Theology Today, Princeton, Vol. 13, 1956, pp. 300-314.

Jones, Geraint Vaughan, God and Negation; Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd Ltd., Vol. 7, 1954, pp. 233-244.

Küng, Hans, Rechtfertigung: Die Lehre Karl Barths und Eine Katholische Besinnung; Einsiedeln, Johannes Verlag, 1957.

Neeser, Maurice, Karl Barth: L'Homme de L'Arête, Essence et Permanence d'une vaste Pensée; Neuchatel, Editions H. Messeiller, 1952.

Prenter, Regin, Die Einheit von Schopfung und Erlosung. Zur Schöpfungslehre Karl Barths; Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel, Friedrich Reinhardt A.G., Vol. 2, 1946, pp. 161-182.

--------------, Die Lehre vom Menschen bei Karl Barth; Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel, Friedrich Reinhardt A.G., Vol. 6, 1950, pp. 211-222.

Weber, Otto, Karl Barth Kirchliche Dogmatik: Ein einführender Bericht zu den Banden I, 1 bis IV, 2, Neukirchen, Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1958.

Wingren, Gustaf, Gott und Mensch bei Karl Barth; Luthertum, Berlin, Lutherisches Verlagshaus, Heft 2, 1951, pp. 3-31.

---------------, Theology in Conflict: Nygren, Barth, Bultmann; translated by Eric H. Wallstrom, Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1958.

III. Studies with a direct reference to the Theology of Karl Barth.

Brown, James, Subject and Object in Modern Theology; The Library of Philosophy and Theology, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1955.

Come, Arnold B., Human Spirit and Holy Spirit; Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1959.

Hendry, George S., The Gospel of the Incarnation; Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1958.

-----------------, The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology; Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956.

Niebuhr, Richard R., Resurrection and Historical Reason: A Study of Theological Method; New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957.

Parker, Thomas, editor, Essays in Christology for Karl Barth; London, Lutterworth Press, 1956.

Ramsey, Paul, editor, Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr; New York, Harper Brothers, 1957.

West, Charles C., Communism and the Theologians: Study of an Encounter; Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1958.

IV. General Works.

Anselm, St., Proslogium, Monologium, An Appendix in Behalf of the Fool by Gaunilon, and Cur Deus Homo; translated by Sidney Deane, La Salle, Illinois, The Open Court Publishing Co., 1954.

Aulen, Gustaf, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement*; translated by A.G. Herbert, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1954.

Baillie, Donald M., *God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement*; New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

Bartsch, Hans Werner, *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate with contributions by Rufolf Bultmann, Ernst Lohmeyer and Others*; translated by Reginald Fuller, London, S.P.C.K., 1953.

Bultmann, Rudolf, *Essays: Philosophical and Theological*; The Library of Philosophy and Theology, translated by James Greig, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1955.

-----------------, *Theology of the New Testament*; in 2 volumes; translated by Kendrick Groben, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951, 1955.

Brunner, Emil, *The Christian Doctrine of God, Dogmatics: Volume I*; translated by Olive Wyon, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1950.

-------------, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, Dogmatics: Volume II*; translated by Olive Wyon, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1952.

-------------, *The Divine-Human Encounter*; translated by Amandus W. Loos, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1943.

-------------, *The Mediator: A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith*; translated by Olive Wyon, London, Lutterworth Press, 1934.

Bushnell, Horace, *The Vicarious Sacrifice: Grounded in Principles interpreted by Human Analogies*; in 2 volumes, New York, Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 1877.

Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*; translated by John Allen, 6th American edition in 2 volumes, Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work.

Campbell, John McLeod, *The Nature of the Atonement and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*; London, James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1959.

Dowey, Edward A. Jr., *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology*; New York, Columbia University Press, 1952.

Feuerbach, Ludwig, The Essence of Christianity; with an introductory essay by Karl Barth, translated by George Eliot, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Forsyth, Peter T., The Work of Christ; London, Independent Press, 1938.

Gogarten, Friedrich, The Reality of Faith: The Problem of Subjectivism in Theology; translated by Carl Michalson and others, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1959.

Jones, Geraint Vaughan, Christology and Myth in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character, Extent and Interpretation of the Mythological Element in New Testament Christology; London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1956.

Kierkegaard, Soren, Philosophical Fragments or a Fragment of Philosophy; translated by David F. Swenson, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1936.

-----------------, The Journals of Soren Kierkegaard; translated by Alexander Dru, London, Oxford University Press, 1938.

-----------------, Concluding Unscientific Postscript; translated by David F. Swenson and Walter Lowrie, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1941.

Luther, Martin, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians; 1535; 'Middleton' edition of English version of 1575, Westwood, New Jersey, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1953.

--------------, Large Catechism; translated by J. N. Lenker, Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1935.

--------------, Three Treatises; translated by C. M. Jacobs, A.T.W. Steinhaeuser, and W.A. Lambert, Philadelphia, The Muhlenberg Press, 1947.

Macquarrie John, An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann; The Library of Philosophy and Theology, London, S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1955.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich, The Christian Faith; edited by H.R. Mackintosh and J.S. Stewart, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1928.

Thielicke, Helmut, Theologische Ethik; in 3 volumes, Tubingen, J.C.B. Mohr, 1951-1958.

Thomas Aquinas, St., Summa Theologica; First and Complete American edition, in 3 volumes, translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province, New York, Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1947.

Tillich, Paul, Systematic Theology: Volume I; Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

-------------, Systematic Theology: Volume II, Existence and the Christ; Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Torrance, Thomas, The School of Faith: The Catechisms of The Reformed Church; translated and edited with an Introduction by Thomas F. Torrance, London, James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1959.

ABBREVIATIONS

C.D. Barth, Karl, Church Dogmatics; vols. I/1 - IV/2.

K.D. Barth, Karl, Kirchliche Dogmatik; vols. I/1 - IV/3, 2.